

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 034 C16

24

UD 009 366

AUTHOR	Eristane, Robert H., Jr., Ed.
TITLE	A Working Conference on Cooperative Programs Among Universities and Predominantly Negro Colleges (Atlanta, Ga., August 20-21, 1965).
Spons Agency	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Cooperative Research Program.
Report No	CEP-Y-C19
Bureau No	ER-5-1159
Pub Date	21 Aug 65
Note	153p.
EDRS Price	EDRS Price MF-\$0.75 HC-\$7.75
Descriptors	Action Research, Administrative Organization, *Cooperative Programs, *Equal Education, *Higher Education, *Negro Colleges, Shared Services, *Universities
Identifiers	Ercwn University, Florida A and M University, Florida State University, Knoxville College, Morristown College, North Carolina College, Southern Illinois University, Tennessee A and I University, Tusculum College, University of Tennessee, University of Wisconsin, Winston Salem State College

Abstract

The proceedings reported are of a working conference designed to provide (1) an opportunity for the universities and predominantly Negro colleges engaged in cooperative programs for the remediation of inequalities in educational opportunities to share their experiences with a view toward increasing the effectiveness of such programs, and (2) a followup of the Conference on Post-Baccalaureate Education that was held at Ercwn University in August, 1964. Four sessions were devoted to discussions bearing upon the specific objectiveness of the conference: providing information on the history, administrative organization, and operation of existing programs; and, formulation of minimum standard operating procedures for the effective development of future cooperative programs. A fifth session covered the summarization of the proceedings of the previous sessions. Appendixes to the conference document describe the following cooperative programs then in operation: University of Tennessee-Tennessee Agricultural and Industrial University, Morristown College, Knoxville College; Florida State University-Florida A and M University; North Carolina College-University of Wisconsin; Winston-Salem State College-Southern Illinois University;

ED034016

*The Working Conference
On
Cooperative Programs
Among Universities
and
Predominantly Negro Colleges*

Cooperative Research Project No. Y-019

ROBERT H. BRISBANE, JR.

Morehouse College

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

BR 5-1159
OE/BR
PA-24

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE
PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION
POSITION OR POLICY.

U9366 E

A WORKING CONFERENCE ON COOPERATIVE
PROGRAMS AMONG UNIVERSITIES AND
PREDOMINANTLY NEGRO COLLEGES

Cooperative Research Project No.Y-019

Edited with an Introduction

by

Dr. Robert H. Brisbane Jr., Chairman,
Department of Political Science,
Morehouse College, Atlanta, Georgia

Editorial Assistant - Norah McNiven

held at

Morehouse College, Atlanta, Georgia

August 20-21,
1965

The research reported herein was
supported by the Cooperative Research
Program of the Office of Education,
U.S. Department of Health, Education,
and Welfare.

Bureau of Research
/

ED034016

0000000000

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Introduction	3
Conference Participants	6
Conference Objectives	9
First Session: History and Administrative Organization	12
Second Session: Concrete Activities Involved in Cooperative Programs	38
Third Session : Concrete Dimensions of the Program	60
Fourth Session: Problems and Plans for the Future	80
Fifth Session : Summary	109
Statements on Cooperative Programs:	
Appendix I (a) University of Tennessee-Tennessee A & I University, Morristown College, Knoxville College	123
I (b) Knoxville College-University of Tennessee	130
II (a) Florida State University-Florida A & M University	134
II (b) Florida A & M University-Florida State University	140
III North Carolina College-University of Wisconsin	143
IV Winston-Salem State College-Southern Illinois University	147
V Brown University-Tougaloo College	152
Related Literature	155

INTRODUCTION

The academic community of the nation has not been immune to the crisis-producing implications of the rapid and dramatic social changes of the present era, among which may be listed the cold war between East and West, the effects of automation and professionalization on the labor force and occupational needs, and the protest by Negroes against all forms of discrimination. Of special interest to educators and educational institutions, of course, has been the struggle for equal opportunity in education. The Supreme Court decision of 1954 removed some of the legal barriers; it is to be hoped that, in the foreseeable future, all remaining barriers to equal opportunity in education will fall.

The lack of equal opportunity in education has affected -- and, of course, still does affect -- not only the small private liberal arts colleges in the South which serve predominantly Negro students but the larger and more affluent academic institutions of higher learning throughout the nation as well. On the one hand, the larger and stronger institutions, in the shift of loyalties and investments from institution and teaching to discipline and research, have tended to lose their human scale and traditional humanistic concerns. On the other hand, many of the smaller schools, and in particular the predominantly Negro institutions, have suddenly -- as Dr. Wesley A. Hotchkiss said -- "got their feet in the door of the educational establishment." Increasingly, these smaller colleges are being measured by universal norms; their students, faculties, and administrators compete increasingly in integrated worlds of study, work, and living. Indeed, in many of the smaller predominantly Negro colleges, a new function has been added to the traditional

task of "taking the student where he is" and providing him with some degree of higher education -- the responsibility for motivating and preparing adequately an increasing number of students for study, work, and life in an integrated society. The basic conclusion in the recently published McGrath report on predominantly Negro institutions of higher learning is that such institutions should be preserved and strengthened in view of the pace and size of the increase in demands for higher education in America.

It is at this point that the value of cooperative programs can be realized; the smaller and less affluent institutions gain from having access to the administrative, teaching and research resources of the stronger institutions, and the latter, through involvement in a working relationship, recall to mind their more ancient and traditional functions and regain their humanistic commitment. Correlatively, both types of institutions necessarily become involved in a process of agonizing reappraisal and must acknowledge the defects of their qualities as well as the qualities of their defects.

Experience to date, limited though it is, indicates that cooperative programs represent a useful method for dealing with the educational problems described, for they are based on areas of mutual concern and are oriented towards the development of invigorating feedbacks throughout the institutions involved. The opportunity to compare factual descriptions of the existing programs, to evaluate them, and to hear their future possibilities discussed have high practical import, not only for programs which might be established in the future, but for those already in operation.

To this end, a conference on cooperative programs (post-baccalaureate education) was held under the auspices of the United States Office of Education at Brown University in August, 1964. The conference with which this paper deals was a follow-up to the Brown University conference, and its

principal aim was to provide an opportunity for the universities and predominantly Negro colleges engaged in cooperative programs during the past year to share their experiences, discuss their problems, and plan for the future. Specific objectives of the conference were: (1) to provide factual information on the history, administrative organization, and operational aspects of the existing programs and (2) to formulate the minimum standard operating procedures for effective development of future cooperative programs. The conference participants also concerned themselves with developing ways of generating data for the evaluation of such programs, establishing a system for the regular exchange of information and data among the participating institutions, educational agencies and private foundations, and the carrying out of related research.

Robert H. Brisbane, Jr.
Director of the Conference.
September, 1965.

CONFERENCE PARTICIPANTS

Dr. Donald Agnew
Southern Association of Colleges
and Schools
795 Peachtree Building
Atlanta, Georgia

Dr. Archie Ayers
U.S. Office of Education
Washington, D.C.

Dr. Robert T. Beyer
Professor of Physics
Brown University
Providence, R.I.

Dr. John Blue
U.S. Office of Education
Washington, D.C.

Dr. Herman Branson
Howard University
Washington, D.C.

Dr. Robert H. Brisbane, Jr.
Chairman, Department of Political
Science
Morehouse College
Atlanta, Georgia

Dr. Russell Brown
Vice President and Dean of the
Graduate School
Tuskegee Institute
Tuskegee, Alabama

Dr. Broadus N. Butler
U.S. Office of Education
Washington, D.C.

Dean Elmer J. Clark
Southern Illinois University
Carbondale, Illinois

President James A. Colston
Knoxville College
Knoxville, Tennessee

Mr. Paul D. Davis
Development Office
Brown University
Providence, R.I.

Dr. J. Curtis Dixon
National Representative
Woodrow Wilson National Fellowship
Foundation
Atlanta, Georgia

Dr. Galen Drewry
Director, Institute of Higher Learning
University of Georgia
Athens, Georgia

Dr. Leslie Dunbar
Southern Regional Council, Inc.
5 Forsyth Street, N.W.
Atlanta, Georgia.

President Sam Duncan
Livingstone College
Salisbury, North Carolina

Dr. Donald Gray
Department of English
Indiana University
Bloomington, Indiana

Dr. Hugh Gloster
Hampton Institute
Hampton, Virginia

Mr. Ted Hammock
University of Georgia
Athens, Georgia

Mr. Wesley Harris
Wilberforce University
Wilberforce, Ohio

Dr. Tom Henderson, President
Virginia Union University
Richmond, Virginia

Dr. Lawrence Howard
Institute of Human Relations
University of Wisconsin
Madison, Wisconsin

Dr. Barnaby C. Keeney, President
Brown University
Providence, R.I.

Dean Thomas R. Lewis
Florida State University
Tallahassee, Florida

Dr. Herman Long, President
Talladega College
Talladega, Alabama

Dr. Albert E. Manley, President
Spelman College
Atlanta, Georgia

Dr. Theodore Marchese
American Council on Education
1785 Massachusetts Ave., N.W.
Washington, D.C.

Dr. Benjamin E. Mays, President
Morehouse College
Atlanta, Georgia

Mr. Donald McNeil
University of Wisconsin
Madison, Wisconsin

Dr. Paul Messier
U.S. Office of Education
Washington, D.C.

Dr. James Miller
Southern Regional Education Board
130 6th Street, N.W.
Atlanta, Georgia

Dr. John Monro
Harvard College
Cambridge, Massachusetts

Dr. Samuel M. Nabrit, President
Texas Southern University
Houston, Texas

Dr. George A. Owens, President
Tougaloo College
Jackson, Mississippi

Mr. Robert Owens, III
Southern University
Baton Rouge, Louisiana

Dr. Lafayette Parker
Dean of Instruction
Winston-Salem College
Winston-Salem, North Carolina

Dr. Cecil Patterson
Director, The Summer School
North Carolina College
Durham, North Carolina

Dr. Benjamin Perry
Florida A & M University
Tallahassee, Florida

Dr. Harold L. Pfautz
Professor of Sociology at Brown University
and Director of the Brown-Tougaloo
Cooperative Program
Brown University, R.I.

Dr. Samuel Proctor
Associate General Secretary for
Communications
National Council of Churches
475 Riverside Drive
New York, N.Y.

Dr. James F. Rogers
U.S. Office of Education
Washington, D.C.

Dr. Hans Rosenhaupt
Woodrow Wilson National Fellowship
Foundation
Princeton, New Jersey

Dr. William J. Schlatter
University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, Michigan

Dr. Herman Spivey
Vice President for Academic Administration
University of Tennessee
Knoxville, Tennessee

Dr. John Summerskill
Professor of Administration
Cornell University
Ithaca, New York

Dr. Charles Turner
Executive Vice President
Stillman College
Tuscaloosa, Alabama

Dr. Arnold Zurcher
Alfred P. Sloan Foundation
630 Fifth Avenue
New York, New York

Director of the Conference - Dr. Robert H. Brisbane, Jr.
Conference Secretary - Mrs. Beatrice Sumlin

CONFERENCE OBJECTIVES

The working conference on cooperative programs among universities and predominantly Negro Colleges was held at Morehouse College, Atlanta, Georgia, on August 20 and 21, 1965. Dr. Robert H. Brisbane, Jr., Professor and Chairman of the Department of Political Science, Morehouse College, initiated the conference and was its director.

The major objectives of the conference were:

- A. To develop guidelines that will enable major colleges and universities to increase the opportunities for and effectiveness of cooperative programs with the smaller institutions. This will be accomplished through a description and evaluative analysis of the histories and range of administrative arrangements of cooperative programs; a description and evaluation of the concrete dimensions of the existing programs; a detailed consideration of the problems encountered, the means by which these problems have been resolved, and a discussion of the future of cooperative programs in the light of past empirical experience.
- B. To develop ways for generating data for the evaluation of such programs and to establish a system for the regular exchange of information and data among the participating institutions. In relation to the former it might be useful to develop a standard reporting form dealing with program developments; in the latter instance, a cooperative relationship might be worked out with the American Council on Education which publishes Expanding Opportunities, a clearing house report on the Negro and higher education.
- C. To provide a follow-up for the Conference on Post-Baccalaureate Education that was held at Brown University in August, 1964.

Among the questions with which the Conference was expected to deal were:

- I. Session on History and Administrative Organization of Cooperative Programs.
 - a) What, in fact, have been the original motives, nature of preliminary talks, and personnel involved in the beginning phases?
 - b) What persons, in terms of their official roles and professional competencies, have become involved in the administration of cooperative programs?
 - c) What has been the degree of commitment on the part of the institutions involved?
 - d) What has been the degree of involvement of personnel and resources of the participating institutions?

- e) Given the range of original motivations, administrative arrangements, commitments, and involvements, is there any consensus concerning which are most productive?
- f) From the point of view of strategy, is it more useful to start with a small program and increase the involvement, or to start with a broad and inclusive concept of cooperation?
- g) To what extent should the administration of cooperative programs involve a separate staff?

II. Session on Working Dimensions of Cooperative Programs.

- a) What kinds of activities have the working relationship of such programs involved?
- b) Could there be any priorities concerning the concrete dimensions: for example, student, faculty, administrative exchanges, developmental and public relations operations; alumni relations; physical plant and academic planning; recruitment and admissions?
- c) Is there any consensus on the minimum productive time for faculty, student and administrative exchanges?
- d) How much of the cooperative working relationships involve primarily research activities?
- e) What have been the results to date of the post-baccalaureate educational programs?

III. Session on Problems and Plans for the Future.

- a) How do such cooperative programs relate to the local and national communities and to the Negro protest movement?
- b) What types of resistance have been encountered among faculties, students, alumni, administration, and others?
- c) To what extent is the "style" of such programs important in their success?
- d) Are there any criteria which would suggest the kinds of colleges that present the best probabilities for successful cooperative working relationships?
- e) To what extent have the private foundations and government agencies understood and supported such cooperative programs?
- f) Is there some logical division of function between the private foundations and the federal government in their support of such programs?

- g) Given the trend for college professors to shift their loyalties from the local institution and teaching to research and the discipline, what approaches have been successful in persuading faculty members to volunteer for participation in cooperative programs?
- h) In connection with student, faculty and administrative exchanges, what mechanisms have been employed to overcome differentials in tuition and salary when they exist?
- i) Should an attempt be made to establish a central organization for the administration and funding of cooperative programs, or should they continue to be operated on an individual basis?
- j) What, in fact, are the costs involved in such programs -- financial, psychological, administrative?

FIRST SESSION
HISTORY AND ADMINISTRATIVE ORGANIZATION
OF COOPERATIVE PROGRAMS

Dr. Pfautz moderated the first session.

Dr. Benjamin E. Mays, President, Morehouse College, welcomed the participants to the conference by assuring them that Morehouse College was happy to sponsor the conference in view of the interest of the college in anything designed to improve the quality of education for Americans, and particularly in anything concerned with improving the quality of education for Negro Americans.

Dr. Brisbane, the director of the conference, also greeted the participants and informed them that the program would go according to schedule.

Dr. Pfautz gave information which he had received from Mr. Green, a member of the United States House of Representatives for Oregon, who has been a central figure in the development of the Higher Education Bill of 1965, anticipating that the Bill would be considered on the Floor of the House during the week following the conference and that, hopefully by the end of the Congressional session, cooperative programs would be receiving support under Title III.

The first session of the conference was basically concerned with the history and administrative organization of cooperative programs between universities and predominantly Negro colleges. The main discussants were persons charged primarily with the development of these programs in their respective institutions.

Dr. Howard opened the discussions by saying that the history of the cooperative and exchange program between Wisconsin and Texas Southern, North Carolina College and North Carolina A & T is to be found in terms of an effort to expand educational opportunities for all. It was rooted in the idea of advancing educational equality with the realization that the nation is confronted with a situation of de facto segregation in education, particularly in the Northern universities. Also taken into consideration were the numerous opportunities presented to Northern universities by linking themselves with Southern institutions serving predominantly Negro students. The University of Wisconsin felt it had a major role to play in helping to bring about an integrated society for America, the first step towards which would be equality of education.

The three schools with which Wisconsin cooperates are in one of the most significant regions of the country. All are concerned with improving and developing new uses of educational media and the new teaching technology, and, in particular, with the instructional components. They have highly qualified staffs and administrations with drive and imagination. It was felt from the inception that the program would be of mutual benefit to all institutions, bringing to American education something that America needs.

Mr. McNeil said the President of Wisconsin had asked him to investigate what the University could do in the field of Negro relations, and a Committee on Cooperation had been established, chaired by Mr. Jack Barbash of the Department of Economics; Dr. Pfautz had been appointed Program Developer. Mr. McNeil said he had worked closely with the presidents of the three cooperating institutions, who, in turn, had appointed coordinators to assume the responsibility for the administration of their individual programs - Dr.

Patterson at North Carolina College, Dr. Williams at North Carolina A & T and Dr. Latch at Texas Southern. Negotiations had been entered into with Mr. Fred Jackson of the Carnegie Foundation for funds for launching the program. The Committee on Cooperation at Winsconsin included representatives from agriculture, engineering, letters and sciences, and education, and this was found to be extremely valuable in getting the faculty interested.

Dr. Nabrit said that he felt it was important to mention at this point that four years ago a committee from the Negro colleges had met with the Committee on Innovation and Experimentation in Education under the Office of Science and Technology at the White House, at the invitation of Mr. Jerry Wisner and Mr. Gerald Zacharias, to discuss the problems in Negro colleges and the ways in which the colleges could get assistance. At this meeting, he had been designated to continue the relationship with the Office of Science and Technology and was subsequently appointed a vice-chairman of a committee of the American Council on Education to work in the areas of broadening opportunities in higher education for Negroes. Elvis Stahr, President, Indiana University, had been named chairman of the committee, which had sent a memorandum to foundations and to institutions of higher education suggesting the one way to improve the standards of Negro colleges would be through support of joint associations between colleges and universities. Models for this type of association already existed in terms of consortia which worked with institutions for development, and he cited, as an example, the special relationship taken on by MIT with the City University of Oklahoma for complete revamping and development.

Dr. Nabrit said that Representative Green, who had been most impressed with the relationship between Brown and Tougaloo and concerned with its high

cost of implementation, had subsequently suggested that in the Higher Education Bill a title should be included which would make support possible for cooperative programs. He said that members of the committee had been aware of the fact that no one institution could serve as a model for all other institutions, for no single institution has enough strength to free its faculty and provide everything that a struggling institution would require. For that reason, the joint association idea should be broadened to include the concept that groups of institutions might participate. He continued by saying that, since the time of the committee meeting, another meeting had been held by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools which involved about nine institutions and eleven colleges, with a view to making a reasonable consortia for improvement in their institutions. A great deal of information had been collected by these institutions, which are now looking forward to providing opportunities on the Southern scene for the release of faculty strength, etc. Dr. Nabrit said he felt the point has almost been reached where almost every college of strength, both white and Negro, have exchange arrangements of some kind, some of which are supported by funds from outside foundations and the others simply by mutual interest and concern on the parts of the institutions involved.

Dr. Branson asked at what levels the various programs operate and how much money is spent annually in each of the programs.

Dr. Nabrit replied that in the Wisconsin-Texas Southern, North Carolina College and North Carolina A & T program, they have \$150,000 a year to be used by the three colleges and there are some overhead costs for the University. In the Texas Southern-Indiana program, Texas Southern had received a grant of \$600,000 for a five-year period and Indiana had received \$150,000 for the five-

year period to underwrite the dislocation costs for the faculty. Dislocation costs are brought about when a faculty member moves from one campus to another for an indefinite period, necessitating the upkeep of residence in both places. Salaries at Texas Southern, Indiana and Wisconsin do not take care of this and the differentials need to be underwritten. For this reason, the parent universities receive a grant as well as the home institution of the exchange faculty member.

Dr. Patterson said that the history of the program at North Carolina College had followed closely that of Texas Southern. The Wisconsin Liaison Committee had been formed for taking the responsibility of the program and for liaison with Wisconsin. The committee receives proposals, either approves or disapproves of them, transmitting its recommendations to the president, who, in turn, approves or disapproves. If approved, the proposal is taken up with Wisconsin. Included among the committee members at North Carolina College are: The Dean of the Graduate School, whose field is history; the Dean of the Undergraduate School, whose field is education; and himself, who serves as chairman of the committee and whose field is English. The committee has listed the qualifications necessary for participation in the program and a memorandum was circulated to the faculty for their information and for their interest in participation. Twenty-five members of the faculty had submitted applications for the long-term study project, ten of whom had been named to the president, who, in turn, selected five to participate in this particular project.

Dr. Patterson said all other projects are handled in the same manner -- applications to the committee who screens them before presenting them to the president. When the president approves, the proposal is handed back to the

committee for referral to the Program Developer at Wisconsin, Dr. Howard, for presentation to its Committee on Cooperation with Negro Universities.

The Wisconsin Liaison Committee at North Carolina College has also set up certain priorities as to the direction of the programs, etc. and the amount of money involved for one year.

Dr. Blue asked if recommendations made to Wisconsin were always accepted.

Dr. Patterson replied that the North Carolina College committee recommendations had been accepted so far, unless the faculty member concerned had not been accepted for admission by the University of Wisconsin Graduate School under normal procedure. When asked if faculty members could apply for graduate study at universities other than Wisconsin, Dr. Patterson replied that this was allowed and that five persons were ready to attend other universities at that time.

Dr. Zurcher of the Sloan Foundation asked if research were limited primarily to educational matters or whether it could involve the disciplinary area.

Dr. Patterson replied that research could be involved in any area.

Dr. Butler said that two instruments in the history of cooperative programs should be mentioned at this point. One, the ad hoc committee of the American Council had not only developed and coordinated many of the programs but it had initiated the publication of a clearing house report, edited by Ted Marchese and entitled Expanding Opportunity. The other agency is the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity, which provided probably the basic interest in the earlier stages of the formation of sister relationships in the Mid-West. This group, which is now called the Mid-Western Inter-University

Conference, has met four times, starting at the University of Michigan at Wayne, then at Wisconsin and Illinois, and out of these meetings had come some of the very valuable information on inter-university relationships.

Dr. Blue asked Dr. Patterson if North Carolina College had exchange arrangements for administrators and potential administrators because of the great shortage of competency in this area and in the feedback and ventilation of institutions.

Dr. Patterson replied that, in most instances, the administrators at North Carolina College were members of the faculty and could therefore participate in any of the program areas.

Dr. Brown was called upon to discuss the program between Tuskegee Institute and the University of Michigan. He said that in April, 1963, Dr. Foster, the president of Tuskegee, and Dr. Hatcher, the president of the University of Michigan, had met with the primary purpose of enlisting the aid of Michigan in developing Tuskegee's program in the humanities, following the organization of their College of Arts and Sciences. A group of people from Michigan, including the vice-president, Dr. Roger Heyns, and his assistant, Dr. Ed Miller, had visited Tuskegee and an agreement had been made involving not only cooperation with the program in the humanities but with almost every other program at Tuskegee. During this visit, it had been realized that Tuskegee offered Michigan an excellent base for studies and research in the social sciences.

During a second conference held during that summer, an informal memorandum of agreement had been developed involving the following: a cultural exchange, joint research, faculty exchange, student exchange, faculty recruitment for

both schools, consultations on administrative problems, graduate and undergraduate student recruitment, consultations on academic program development, and library development. The cooperative program, now beginning its third year, has proceeded along these lines, with the administrative relationship between Michigan and Tuskegee being intentionally quite informal. Dr. Brown said that Dr. Heyns had been the liaison officer for Michigan and that his successor will be carrying on with the help of Dr. William Schlatter. During the two years of the program, there were from twenty-five to thirty group visits among persons from both campuses.

Dr. Brown estimated the cost of the program at \$50,000, which had mostly been used to cover transportation and telephone costs, although some money had been needed to defray the costs of differential and faculty exchange. The money, so far, had come from the budgets of the two institutions concerned, the initial research grant being \$25,000 from each school.

Dr. Butler asked how much of that money had come from the Office of Education.

Dr. Brown replied that, so far as he knew, the Office of Education had not been involved in that particular program.

Dr. Butler said the program was a three-year project and had come under the Cooperative Research Division, but that he would need to find the exact amount of money involved.

Dr. Blue supplied a figure of better than \$100,000 and added that it was most important that all monies spent be recorded accurately so that when future programs were set up, they would not be underfunded because their budgets had

been based on the not-quite-accurate figures of some of some of the existing programs. He also stressed the importance of recording in detail all the procedures followed in setting up new programs for possible future reference.

Dr. Owens opened his statement on the Tougaloo-Brown program by saying that a great deal of the initiative had been taken by Tougaloo and he felt it was important to mention that a developing institution should have evaluated its condition and prepared itself to enter a cooperative arrangement. Tougaloo had realized back in 1963 that the new day of opportunity for the students it served brought into focus a new requirement and a new demand, and it had become abundantly clear to them that Tougaloo must strengthen its resources. Being jointly sponsored by two church denominations, the United Church of Christ and the Disciples of Christ, which are limited in what they can do for the college, Tougaloo had to seek new ways to carry on and develop. Two of the trustees at Tougaloo had spoken to Dr. Keeney, the president of Brown, and to Mr. Dan Earl in the Brown Development Office. Mr. Paul Davis, also of the Brown Development Office, and Mr. Bob Schultz, a sociologist at Brown, now dean of the university, had visited Tougaloo to make a survey of the ways in which Brown could assist in their development.

Dr. Owens said that sometimes it is a little embarrassing for the developing institution to have its total soul completely bared and to be stripped naked before the world. It is much the same situation as that faced by developing countries which are helped by stronger countries such as the United States. But at Tougaloo they had been challenged to step forward into the twentieth century as fully-fledged competitors with the already-developed universities, and therefore felt that in a cooperative arrangement with one of these universities they had a friend standing to advise and help them. The cooperative

programs help shorten the period when a developing institution, such as Tougaloo, is able to step forward and meet the challenge.

He felt inclined to agree with the former president of Brown, Dr. Riston, in that no chart of organization or sharply defined duties could be expected or should be developed in these programs, and that there was no such thing as an institutional pattern -- things had to be played by ear. He felt the partnership and the working arrangements are largely determined by the personalities involved. Dr. Pfautz had been appointed Coordinator of the Brown-Tougaloo program for a period of two years, and had spent the first semester of the 1964-1965 school year on the Tougaloo campus identifying Tougaloo's needs and mobilizing Brown's resources. Although Dr. Pfautz's appointment had been for two years only, the relationship with Brown is open-ended as to time and commitment.

The program is concerned with fund raising, recruitment and admissions, possible baccalaureate programs, master planning, visiting faculty, curriculum development, library development, pre-freshman programs, student exchange, research in linguistics projects and all other conceivable phases of the operation of a college. There has been full access for consultation and visitation with and by the faculty and administrative staff of Tougaloo to Brown, and faculty members from Brown visit Tougaloo when and if they are needed.

Dr. Pfautz said that most of the initiative in connection with the Brown participation in the program had come from the president of Brown, who, after discussions with people at Tougaloo, had brought the matter of a working relationship between his faculty in the spring of 1964. From a strictly administrative point of view, Dr. Pfautz said he had been directly responsible to the

presidents of the two institutions, which may sound simple, but can be complex at times. He attended the sessions of the Tougaloo Board of Trustees in their executive committee meetings, which are held monthly, as well as two regular Board meetings. He also met with the Educational Policy Committee, which is the faculty administrative committee at Tougaloo which makes policy. He traveled a great deal between the two institutions and tried to represent the program to various officials in the government as well as educational agencies and foundations. The program had received a grant of \$250,000 from the Ford Foundation from the Fund for the Advancement of Education for a period of two years to support a variety of preliminary projects. In addition to the Ford grant, the program had received approximately another \$100,000 from various other private foundations last year and hoped to receive a similar amount this year.

Dr. Perry said that he had heard Dr. Nabrit mention the fact that Representative Green had been impressed with the Brown-Tougaloo program and wished to have more details of specific things such as faculty improvement or upgrading of faculty and the relationship in terms of the curriculum. He asked for the specifics of what was done once the needs at Tougaloo had been identified.

Dr. Pfautz said he hoped he could delay the reply to that question until the afternoon session when the specifics would be discussed in detail. However, in the meantime, he could say that he had been in a position to have some idea of what goes on at Tougaloo and to communicate that information to the relevant people at Brown.

Dr. Rutler asked to whom the grants mentioned by Dr. Pfautz had been made.

Dr. Pfautz said that, with one exception of one small grant of \$5,000,

they had been made to Tougaloo which has held and expended the money.

Dr. Butler asked who determined the budget.

Dr. Pfautz replied that the presidents of the two institutions worked with him on the budget and that the actual money was given to Tougaloo.

Dr. Butler said he felt it was most important that the question asked by Dr. Perry regarding specifics was answered because one of the serious dimensions of cooperative programs and their future which the Office of Education is going to have to face is how to answer Congressional inquiries regarding the criteria used for dispensing federal funds and on federal involvement. He said that Congress would also wish to know what the cooperative programs are seeking and hoped that the answer to this question would come out of this conference, thus enabling the agencies of the federal government to act. He suggested that action might not be confined to the Office of Education but that the Office of Equal Opportunity as well as other agencies might be interested.

Referring back to the serious exploration of needs and resources at Tougaloo and Brown, Dr. Butler said he felt that some of the contents of the exploration should be given, in view of the fact that the Brown-Tougaloo relationship had produced such good results.

Dr. Pfautz responded to this request by saying that Mr. Davis and Mr. Schultz had spent approximately one week at Tougaloo, interviewed every member of the faculty as well as the administration and developed a lengthy report on the strengths and weaknesses at Tougaloo. The report was the solid basis for the ultimate decisions.

Dr. Butler asked if a copy of that report were available to the partici-

pants in the conference and to the persons in the Office of Education who are involved in the cooperative programs.

Dr. Pfautz replied that he would defer to Dr. Owens for a reply to that question.

Dr. Owens said that sometimes the internal situation of an institution is a little embarrassing to expose to the whole world, but that he would provide Dr. Butler with an outline.

Dr. Butler asked if the outline would be of the basic design, for that is what would be considered important.

Dr. Pfautz said he would like to mention at that point that the tradition of cooperation was evident because the faculty members cooperated fully and the information was sent right down the line.

Dr. Butler said he could only stress how important this matter was by saying that the terminology had been intentional. There had been much discussion by the Office of Education in an attempt to find a suitable term, and the term "developing" has given them a great deal of trouble because the question is constantly asked: Who is and what is a developing institution? He said that at some future point, the Office of Education may have some voice in the financing of cooperative programs (and incidentally, any federal money put into programs under Title III would be supplemental money and not initial or "seed" money) and any project assisted by federal funds would require some design and some prospectus in terms of aims and goals for the developing institution as well as the positive values for the parent institution. He said there should also be some information regarding the manner in which these

institutions conceived the idea of cooperating with each other. If it were necessary for the Office of Education to be selective in the disposal of the small amount of funds available for the initial outlay, this conference would be of real service if it could provide definitive, or as close to definitive as possible, guide lines.

Dr. Blue said that he must go beyond the point of the distribution of money and the selection of programs, because, when contracts are entered into, there must be a closing period and reports as to what had been done with the funds. This was especially true when federal funds are used, because in programs involving federal money an evaluation would be required.

Dr. Nabrit said that he had testified for the American Council before Representative Green's committee to the effect that any institution could be improved if it were given additional resources. The Council committee had felt this was not specific enough and suggested that institutions seeking support under Title III should be either accredited or certified by the regional association, or that they were close to accreditation and under the guidance of the appropriate accreditation agency. Dr. Nabrit said that it is very difficult to be absolutely specific in terms of the details and goals. One panel of experts would assume that in a small undergraduate college, research would be unnecessary and that good teaching would be more worthy of support. A different panel at a different time might feel that to have excellent science teaching it would be necessary to have it carried out in a creative environment. He felt there would be many variations in the evaluations of institutions and, in some instances, it might be said that funds poured into them might be wasted, however, a difficult decision for an institution to make is that it should go out of business. But he believed that

somewhere along the line it could be assumed that, with reasonable support, there would be the possibility of a reasonable degree of excellence obtained at which the institution in question would certainly be above the minimum requirements for approval.

Dr. Gloster, outlining the history of the Hampton Institute-Cornell University program, said that in the fall of 1963, representatives of Hampton met with representatives of Cornell and Yale to discuss the possibility of planning and operating joint programs. Even before financial help had been secured, Cornell and Hampton jointly granted all-expense fellowships to ten Hampton teachers for graduate study at Cornell during the summers of 1964 and 1965, conducted a faculty lecture exchange during the summers of 1964 and 1965 and arranged all-expense fellowships for a Hampton instructor at Cornell during the school years 1964-1965 and 1965-1966. Cornell had also directed two of its outstanding young graduate students to positions on the Hampton faculty and has recommended others.

When it became obvious that additional funds would be needed to support the interchange, the two schools applied to the Office of Education in 1964 for a grant for a pilot program of faculty, staff and student exchange, which grant has been received.

Dr. Gloster continued by saying that as a result of the Yale-Hampton discussions in the fall of 1963, these two institutions launched in the summer of 1964 an all-expense, six-week summer high school for 100 mentally superior but culturally disadvantaged white and Negro boys. He said that Hampton has also participated in a number of miscellaneous programs that may be classified as cooperative, but that it wished to avoid any academic relationship in which Hampton might be stamped with a stigma of inferiority or treated in a

condescending manner. He said he felt Hampton could gain from a large university the same benefits that any other good small college could gain from such a relationship and that Hampton could make a significant contribution to any large university with which it was associated.

Reverting to the Hampton-Cornell program, Dr. Gloster said that a joint committee had been formed, that he had been appointed the chairman of the Hampton group and Dr. John Summerskill, the chairman of the Cornell group. The initial stimulus for the program at Hampton came from a discussion between Dr. Holland, the president of Hampton, and members of the administration at Cornell. At the beginning, the program had been financed by their own funds, but a grant in excess of \$100,000 had recently been received from the Office of Education.

Dr. Summerskill said that Cornell's initiative in discussing and developing the program with Dr. Holland, Dr. Gloster and members of the Hampton faculty had come from Cornell's concern about the segregated nature of the Cornell campus. Cornell, from the outset, had looked upon this exchange program precisely as an exchange program, as an opportunity to bring to Cornell students with different backgrounds, faculty with different backgrounds, and to overcome, to some extent, both the racial and emotional segregation which has plagued the large Northern campuses. The program at Cornell is tied in closely with an intensified recruiting effort to get young Negro students to enter the university as undergraduates. Cornell has moved from four Negroes entering a class of between 2,500 and 3,00 students this past year to 40 entering this coming year. Cornell's limitation in this regard is state money; it is looking for \$10,000 for scholarships for these students and feels that it is exploding effectively the myth that qualified young people

are not available. Dr. Summerskill said he knew qualified young people were available and that Cornell was not competing with Hampton or the other schools -- they have not moved into these areas due to lack of opportunity and funds. He added that Cornell has tried not to formalize the work of the program, although the program has had support through official faculty resolutions.

Dr. Perry asked for the degree and type of action between the two groups of the joint committee.

Dr. Gloster said that on each campus, there is the equivalent of a director, and two assistants, one called the program assistant and the other the research assistant. These individuals have secretarial assistants. However, he said, the closest contact had been between Dr. Summerskill and himself.

Dr. Summerskill said that the joint committee had met on three or four occasions, and in reply to a question by Dr. Pfautz, said that Cornell and Hampton had borne the costs of travel until the grant had been received from the federal government.

Dr. Duncan asked if, considering the diversity of the programs, either institution had made a formal evaluation of the program prior to the conference.

Dr. Gloster replied that although a formal evaluation of the Cornell-Hampton program had not yet been made, the grant from the Office of Education included a provision that three on-the-spot visits be made by three outside distinguished educators not connected in any way with Hampton or Cornell and that these people would be preparing a written report this year.

Dr. Pfautz said that in connection with the Brown-Tougaloo program, a lengthy narrative which had not been set up in evaluative terms has been filed with the Ford Foundation.

Dr. Brown said that Tuskegee and Michigan have filed a pretty complete statement regarding what had been done up to the present with the Ford Foundation.

Dr. Howard said that Wisconsin is also in the process of reporting to the Carnegie Foundation and that an evaluation is something that must continue in time and requires criticism from many points of view. One person had been sent to each of the cooperative institutions to make an evaluation to the committee from his own perspective.

Dr. Blue said that evaluation and research were most important. Research is the handmaiden of administration and feeds back a great deal of information which shows whether one is in or out of balance. He felt skills for handling research could and should be developed.

Dr. Patterson said that North Carolina College had also filed a report with the Carnegie Foundation. Wisconsin handles the bulk of the clerical work and North Carolina College sends its reports to Wisconsin who compile it into one document.

Dr. Pfautz said that in terms of his experience with the Brown-Tougaloo program, the question of evaluation in terms of success or failure is a long-range thing and the question of what is involved in contrast to a specific research operation is quite different. He said he hoped that the Office of Education and other government agencies will recognize the qualitative differ-

ences of the tasks that are involved.

Dr. Turner said that the motivation in the Stillman-Indiana cooperative program had been the same as in other programs -- the desire to upgrade the total quality of the institution and to move to a new level. Stillman, being in Alabama, had heard of the Brown-Tougaloo and Tuskegee-Michigan programs and their accomplishments, and had asked Mr. Larry Dennis of the American Council on Education to help them locate an institution interested in joining Stillman in a cooperative endeavor. Mr. Dennis knew that Dr. Stahr, the president of Indiana, was interested in such a program and the two institutions were brought together and held their first joint meeting in September, 1964.

The program has actually been in operation for about eight months. The organizational pattern has been an informal one, with the Dean and Vice-President for Undergraduate Development serving as the liaison person at Indiana and the vice-president at Stillman serving as liaison for Stillman. Committees on each campus include administrative personnel and faculty, and the members of the committees have met jointly at least three times since January, 1965. Costs so far for telephone, transportation and correspondence have been in the vicinity of about \$12,000, but with the foundation grant and interest in the program, the funding now stands at \$65,000, which will include an experimental program on the freshman level. The concrete things accomplished so far have involved faculty and student visits; a number of Stillman students will be entering Indiana for graduate work on fellowships, and several faculty members from Stillman were at Indiana during the summer of 1965.

Dr. Gray said he could only stress that the organization of the Stillman-Indiana program was quite informal, but he felt that another way to establish a relationship was through disciplines rather than through schools. There is

a Committee on the Teaching of Art and History, the chairman of which is Mr. Albert Olsen of Indiana, whose members from predominantly Negro schools and major Northern schools meet for the purpose of library and traveling shows, and faculty and student exchange. He hoped that similar committees could be organized for teachers of English from predominantly Negro schools and for teachers of the same or similar subjects in a whole range of schools, as he felt that teachers had more in common than schools have. If these relationships were established, Dr. Gray said they would be separate programs, administered by their own committees and their own organizational structure.

Dr. Perry asked how these relationships would be financed, for relationships based on discipline facilities seemed a good idea.

Dr. Gray said that he thought the Olsen Committee on Art and History was financed by a small group from a private foundation and by some money from the Indiana University foundation, which had also given \$10,000 to the Stillman project. It is the job of Dr. Olsen's committee to write proposals for money to private individuals and to professional groups. Dr. Olsen had visited something like fifteen predominantly Negro colleges in the South by arranging to give lectures at nearby State universities, thus taking care of the travel costs. Once in the South, he planned his own itinerary. Dr. Olsen has a fairly sizable grant for this, but Dr. Gray said he did not know the exact amount. He did know, however, that Dr. Olsen had received another foundation grant to allow about twenty teachers of art and history in the Negro institutions to take a whole summer in studio work at Smith for the purpose of reaffirming a sense of themselves as artists rather than as art educators.

Dr. Turner said that most institutions have other programs with a number of institutions outside of their main program. He said that Stillman has

projects with George Washington University and New York University in the areas of political science and the allied arts, and has also made an attempt to form viable relationships with three Southern white liberal arts colleges -- Southwestern at Memphis, Davidson and Agnes Scott -- for summer programs and faculty exchange.

Dr. Nabrit said that so far the kind of relationship that Dr. Branson represented had not been discussed. Most of the predominantly Negro colleges have been supplying faculty personnel for the opportunity to study to some 235 college teachers last summer and 200 college teachers this summer at foundation expense, and that a group of universities had joined together to provide this opportunity. However, Dr. Nabrit said, Dr. Branson and a special newly-formed Educational Improvement Corporation will now have the responsibility of continuing in this area.

Dr. Pfautz said that he hoped Dr. Branson would discuss this program in the afternoon session as this range of operation had indeed broadened.

Dr. Colston was asked to discuss the Knoxville-Tennessee program and opened by saying that Knoxville, like other institutions represented at the conference, has been engaged in several types of cooperative programs including student and faculty exchange. He mentioned one specific program developed through the United Negro College Fund with some colleges in the St. Paul area. The UNCF had approached a foundation, that is basically local in its interests, for a gift. The foundation could not give money but offered a suggestion to colleges in the St. Paul area that cooperative programs with colleges receiving UNCF money might prove mutually beneficial. A committee was formed consisting of members of the colleges in the St. Paul area and the foundation's executive,

and as a result of discussions, the foundation made a sizable grant to the colleges in the St. Paul area for specific cooperative programs with UNCF colleges. Four colleges in the St. Paul area, the College of St. Thomas, Macalester College, Hamline University and Carleton College are now working with six institutions, Knoxville being one. An exchange of faculty has been arranged whereby a professor from St. Thomas will teach at Knoxville for the coming school year and a Negro faculty member of Knoxville will teach at Macalester next year. The professor who comes from St. Thomas to Knoxville will be a senior professor, the junior professor will go from Knoxville to Macalester and will have a dual opportunity -- one, to teach at Macalester and two, to complete graduate work at the University of Minnesota.

Dr. Colston proceeded to explain the organization of this particular program by saying that he represented the liaison for the colleges participating as UNCF colleges and Father Shannon, the president of the College of St. Thomas, is liaison officer for the St. Paul area colleges. The faculty members will be paid their salaries by their respective institutions which will also pay the cost differential for travel etc.

Reverting to the Knoxville-Tennessee program, Dr. Colston said he believed he was the first person at the conference to discuss a relationship between two institutions located in the same geographical area, which, he felt, gave a slightly different picture. Historically, Knoxville and Tennessee have had a close and wonderful working relationship over a long period of time, but approximately two years ago, a more formal organization was discussed. One motivating factor was Tennessee's interest in helping Knoxville, which was at the point of being considered for a grant by two major foundations. Representative of the foundations, Tennessee representatives and members of the Knoxville administration met to discuss Knoxville's existing program and its future.

Tennessee expressed great interest in working with Knoxville for mutual benefit, the grant was received, and representatives of Knoxville visited Tennessee. A formal meeting was arranged between the Vice-President of Academic Affairs, the Assistant Vice-President for Academic Affairs, the Dean of the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, and the Dean of Records and Admissions, of Tennessee, and the Dean and the resident of Knoxville.

Definite areas of cooperation were arrived at and a workable structure for the programs developed. One program area is the upgrading of faculty by offering opportunities to those who had not received their terminal degrees to be released from Knoxville to pursue graduate work at Tennessee. Tennessee will help Knoxville during the time these faculty members are absent by providing quality graduate assistants, teaching fellows and, in some cases, regular Tennessee professors. A second area is the broadening of offerings at Knoxville by making it possible for Knoxville students who have been certified by the Dean and/or recommended by their departmental chairmen, to enter Tennessee. Knoxville will reimburse Tennessee for the costs of the students' standard matriculation fees, and Knoxville will make the provisions for the transportation costs of the students. When students have completed their courses, copies of their grade reports will be sent to Knoxville so that each institution has a record.

Dr. Branson asked how many students had been involved during the last semester.

Dr. Colston replied that he thought there were students in eight different courses, mentioning the problem involved by Knoxville being on the semester system and Tennessee being on the quarter system. He felt there would be a considerably larger number of students involved in the coming year.

Dr. Branson asked if the problem had arisen of meeting prerequisites and background.

Dr. Colston replied that it had not come up so far, for the reason that the Dean and the departmental chairmen at Knoxville had been most careful in determining which students should go to Tennessee.

Dr. Turner asked if there had been any difference in the fee cost for out-of-state students.

Dr. Colston replied that so far this had not been considered an important matter and that perhaps Dr. Spivey should answer this question.

Dr. Spivey said that up to the present, cost differentials had been borne by Tennessee, but the Board of Trustees will have to recognize this in relation to its constituents as the volume increases. He also gave the number of Knoxville students having taken courses at Tennessee last year as 65. He said that the \$150 a quarter out-of-state fee has so far been waived entirely and added that the new program of televised instruction being offered on the Tennessee campus cannot go on for too much longer without charging Knoxville, for this would mean that Tennessee would be offering one quarter of the curriculum of Knoxville to them without charge. However, the trustees of Tennessee have not been informed of this particular problem.

Dr. Spivey said he would like to add a few marks to what Dr. Colston had said about organization and procedure. Although the promotion, enlargement and the administration of the program have been managed by a coordinator of each campus, instead of a single committee on each campus there is an ad hoc joint committee organized according to the nature of the given program. For instance, a research program has the Tennessee people plus the

corresponding people at Knoxville, a television program has the Tennessee committee on television plus the television representatives from Knoxville.

Dr. Spivey agreed with Dr. Colston that in the case of the Knoxville-Tennessee cooperative program, it had been almost spontaneous in view of their geographic proximity. Another of Tennessee's cooperative programs with Tennessee A & I had been stimulated originally by a Trustee of Tennessee who had heard a discussion of the Tennessee-Knoxville program. The trustee, Senator Walters, a wealthy person genuinely interested in education and a resident of Morristown where the junior college is located, suggested to Tennessee that Morristown would provide a good atmosphere for cooperation. Tennessee has provided Morristown with nine consultants on a full-year basis in different aspects of college administration and operations, free of charge.

Dr. Nabrit then commented on a program which Texas Southern had entered into, which involved bringing a professor from England to set up a course on African Affairs. Texas Southern had paid his salary for the first year and transportation costs with funds from the Ford Foundation grant, and the program had been open to students from the University of Houston and Texas Southern, who enrolled without any special fees -- both institutions are state institutions and fees are taken care of in the same manner. This coming year, Dr. Nabrit said, the University of Houston will pay this professor's salary although he will remain on the Texas Southern campus. Houston will provide the scholarships for this program and expand it to allow students from the University of St. Thomas and Rice University to take the course.

Dr. Nabrit added that during the coming year, a Negro professor of mathematics at Texas Southern has been loaned to Rice. The professor will have a reduced teaching load for the year to enable him to carry out his research and

will return to the Texas Southern faculty next year with added confidence and prestige. The arrangement will also allow students at Rice to see that it is possible for persons of other ethnic origins to teach mathematics.

The morning session was adjourned for lunch, with the statement by Dr. Pfautz that representatives of other cooperative programs would be heard immediately following the recess.

SECOND SESSION

THE CONCRETE ACTIVITIES INVOLVED IN COOPERATIVE PROGRAMS

The second session was moderated by Dr. Owens.

Dr. Branson opened the second session by saying that the specific programs with which he had been associated did not fall narratively into the pattern that had been presented so far, but that he wished to give the participants in the conference some idea of what direction the programs were taking and the reasons why they had been organized in a particular manner. He said that foundation support had been received enabling plans to be made for a series of institutes for faculty members, in the belief that whatever is done for faculty members is like putting good educational money in the bank.

He said a second program had concerned itself with the interval between high school and college, for the Nabrit-White-Zacharias report had showed that of ten students entering the predominantly Negro colleges, six or seven drop out. Dr. Branson said his committee was not so much concerned with specific subject matter as it was with the attitudes, habits, thoughts, values, insights, tasks, etc. of students, and consequently two new programs were developed -- one, English and communications around English, and the second, qualitative thinking around mathematics. The pre-college program was financed by the Carnegie Corporation and centers had been established at St. Louis, Webster College, Morehouse College, Nashville and Howard University. This summer, the National Science Foundation had become interested and gave financial support to the mathematics and biology institute at Wisconsin, the psychology institute at Michigan and the physics institute at Fisk. Additional money had been received for the institute in mathematics at Wisconsin and because of

this, ten additional teachers were added to the 30 or 35 being supported by the NSF funds. Although the funds on hand would have covered 100 students at Howard, only 77 attended. Psychology, physics, mathematics and history, and, to a certain extent, engineering, were well attended. Business Administration was not.

The origin of these pre-college programs stemmed from the American Council on Education's ad hoc committee, the chairman of which was the Dean of the Graduate School of City University of New York. An organizational structure was required and the Educational Service Incorporated was asked to handle it, but when it became apparent that the program was increasing and might become too large for ESI, the formation of a new organization was promised. President Warner was retiring as the president of the Carnegie Institute of Technology in Pittsburgh and was prevailed upon to become chairman of the committee developing the new organization. The president of the Rockefeller Institute in New York called a meeting of interested people in New York and the new organization--Institute for Services to Education (ISE) was formed. The ISE has had several meetings to date and has been chartered in Pennsylvania. ISE hopes to continue the pre-college program in view of the good results obtained so far, and in addition, has been asked by certain private foundations to look at some internal programs and by a large government organization to investigate a major program in the pre-college area.

Dr. Branson said he hoped ISE would be able to set up, somewhere in the South, a first-rate graduate program for preparing teachers in English and mathematics for the small liberal arts colleges and junior colleges. He added that the Commission on College Physicists, of which he is a member, is concerned with the entire range of American education and is holding a meeting in October to explore some of the things that need to be done in physics for American

colleges -- not just for the developing schools, but for all colleges throughout the country.

Dr. Summerskill agreed with Dr. Branson that the one-to-one relationship was not adequate and that he knew that some of the colleges represented at the conference have multiple relationships, and, in fact, that most major universities have multiple on-going relationships with other institutions or regional agencies. He asked Dr. Branson what assurance or steps are being taken by ISE to ensure there are enough places for the young people who wish to take part in the pre-college programs.

Dr. Branson said that one thing that is lacking in the program is major full-time people whose job it is to work for the young people and find college placements for them. Of the 179 pre-college students, 143 have already been admitted to college, with 20 more pending. The program also had found jobs for some of the students so that they had earned some money before entering college, and that it has done what it could to stimulate scholarship money. \$50,000 was received from a small foundation for teachers in the program. Some really first-rate fellowships, or actually, sabbatical leave allowances, had been given to eight teachers to enable them to take the terminal degree; they will receive half their academic year salary plus an allowance for transportation, plus an allowance for tuition. In addition, each school will get \$4,000 so that when the teachers return to their schools they will have a reduced load during their first year in order to try out some of the new things they learned in the institute and/or for research. During the second year, the teachers will have at least one third smaller loads in order to continue trying out new methods and/or for research.

Dr. Ayers said that these teacher institutes could not be called consortia and that perhaps Dr. Branson could say something about consortia relationships as there had been one in Washington on the graduate level.

Dr. Branson said he did not know very much about them and did not think they have anything which is operating well.

Dr. Zurcher asked if there is a limitation on the kind of institutions that is invited to participate.

Dr. Branson said he had no details on this question, but a cause for concern is that many of the high schools have outstripped the colleges in their thinking on biology, mathematics, chemistry and physics, and that many college teachers are not competent to handle the new curriculum material. He felt that the pre-college programs should take this under consideration in developing summer institutes.

Dr. Gloster said that Hampton had a number of teachers who are under pressure to obtain degrees and who are, for that reason, not particularly interested in the summer institutes but who would like to have help in undertaking graduate study or continuing graduate studies in their respective fields during the summer. In view of this, Dr. Gloster wondered if the pre-college program had thought in terms of giving summer fellowships to teachers who are more interested in their specializations than in a summer institute which offers no credit.

Dr. Branson said that so far funds had not been found for this aspect. He felt there were many imaginative things that ISE could do, but

not all of them could be sold to people in order to obtain funds. He added that he, personally, would like to see four or five very good colleges in the South where really first-class teachers of English and mathematics could be prepared.

Dr. Colston asked if participants in these institutes were in the regular academic committee.

Dr. Branson said this varied from place to place for the machinery of giving credits is overwhelming. However, he said he felt sure that some of the participants had received credit for their work in the summer institutes.

Dr. Owens said that although this session was a continuation of the morning's session on history and organization, questions concerning concrete activities could be asked and answered.

Dr. Nabrit said he would like to suggest that there would be a possibility of having the professional associations or a group of institutions establish talent pools for a particular subject. The Biology Teachers Association had indicated a willingness to identify some outstanding biologists who would be willing to serve institutions for a semester or a year, and the Physics Teachers Association had made a similar offer. Dr. Nabrit said that it had been felt by Princeton that it did not have all the talent necessary to work with 50 college teachers and so it had brought in other faculty from other sources; the biology program at North Carolina also involved faculty people from at least three different universities. In most instances, he said, the faculty of summer institutes represented several institutions, and that women's colleges in Indiana had operated a program as a consortium. He said that Mr. Zacharias had indicated a willingness to bring universities

together , which had been done, and that in a meeting with the universities, the presidents had expressed interest in subscribing to the talent pools for assisting some of the institutions. Out of these pools, which could be collected from several universities, replacements could be found for the colleges that send their top-flight persons to an institute because providing replacements for faculty and the faculty for the institutes was very difficult for a single institution to do.

Dr. Nabrit said he was firmly convinced that a large amount of talent had been discovered during the summer institutes, but asked what concretely is being done in terms of making it possible for the young people to complete the objectives which are being infused into them and which they have demonstrated their capacity and competence to continue. He said he was most concerned about the latter problem because the section of the Higher Education Bill dealing with student aid and student loan programs had been experiencing difficulties. He felt one answer to the problem would be to state that whenever a good program has been constructed, it has not been necessary to search for students, that there is an implied promissory note in these programs in that if a student's interest is such that he enters into an arrangement with a responsible agency, that agency will admit him into their future educational programs. He also hoped that a scholarship program would be written into the pre-college programs, for provisions should be made for the young people who enter and succeed in them. However, he mentioned a problem in regard to scholarships by saying the competition for scholarships gives the more-advantaged (by exposure) an advantage over the culturally deprived. Figures, although not too accurate, show that in the upper one third income bracket, 55 out of 100 young people of college age actually enter college; in the lower one third bracket it is less than 10 percent, which does

not mean that less than 10 percent are qualified for college admission as has been demonstrated by the results of these programs.

Another problem, Dr. Nabrit said, is the matter of the replacement of distinguished scholars, however, the listing of available replacements by professional organizations would avoid institutions having to scramble for substitutes. The lists could be made available to colleges and to college presidents all over the country if they were circulated in the same manner as Fulbright, Danforth and Woodrow Wilson notices. He felt it was important to discover some kind of device which would locate some of the distinguished scholars in centers where they could become focal points for actual participation by faculty people in the colleges in the area. He mentioned as an example Huntsville, Alabama, where there are not only physicists and other scientists working, but people who have worked at the center at one time or another. He suggested that perhaps ISE could interest these people in the local university and in teaching or serving as consultants.

Dr. Nabrit said that there is a provision in the elementary and secondary education section of the bill for the establishment of curriculum and academic research centers. These centers could be regionally located, and directed by a competent person along the lines of the Argonne Laboratory which is independent of, but cooperates with, local school boards. He felt a move should be made in the direction of the establishment of at least one of these centers which could then be used for solving some of the problems he had mentioned.

Dr. Branson said that there has been a program of follow-up of the summer institutes by consultants in a certain area checking with the teachers who had attended them to see how much progress they had made, to look at their

equipment and see how they are handling their laboratories. He said that perhaps NSF matching funds could be used for follow-ups, which cost a good deal of money.

Dr. Butler said teachers participating in the pre-college program expressed a wish that there were some continuity in them. However, he added, that it was difficult for an institution which had an initial NSF grant to obtain supporting grants from NSF or from any other agencies. He felt that follow-ups, beyond the immediate special type project, were important -- if only from the point of obtaining future funds.

Dr. Branson asked Dean Monroe of Harvard if he would give information on the Harvard program with Miles College.

Dr. Monroe said that he was still not clear as to Harvard's role in relation to the efforts being described at the conference. Harvard has a number of programs which it has been trying out; the law school has 50 college juniors from the Negro colleges in session this summer and is trying to interest them in law as a career and the summer school has another 40 or 50 juniors trying to help them find their way towards a graduate school interest.

The relationship between Miles and Harvard, he said, is still in an early stage compared to the programs already discussed at the conference, but he felt it well to remember that a great many colleges are not yet involved in programs and that of those that will become involved, a great many will have to face the different stages of evolution. He continued by saying that the relationship between Miles and Harvard has been a personal effort by individuals rather than a formal one between two institutions. The relationship, which started in September, 1963, has had as its prime concern three

areas -- pre-freshman and freshman English, the development of student volunteer services, and the encouragement of teaching fellows to teach at Miles.

A joint Harvard-Miles staff, supplemented by three Birmingham high school teachers, conducted a six-week pre-college English program for 30 Birmingham high school students entering college. Apart from the teaching of the students, Harvard was interested in discovering ways in which the students had been short-changed in English in high school and how best the deficiencies could be repaired in the brief period between high school graduation and college. (This had had a remarkable similarity to what Dr. Branson's group had been doing at Wellesley in preparing a curriculum and Dr. Monroe said he had exchanged ideas and information with this group at the end of the summer.) The Miles basic school workshop had had a remedial program for entering freshmen, with 200 students enrolled and a young staff of eight who had been recruited from Miles and Harvard; this effort also had been exploratory, for Harvard had been interested in continuing its study of deficiencies and means to counteract them and also in trying to sketch out a suitable freshman English curriculum for the regular Miles year. Dr. Monroe said that they had had to recruit young teachers to teach in this program also.

The student volunteer service effort, which had not been mentioned before in the conference, was of great consequence to him because of its great value for the undergraduates at Harvard. In the summer of 1964, 15 men and women, members of the Harvard-Phillips House, a student volunteer association service center, cooperated with a similar number of Mississippi graduates in conducting a reading enrichment program for 300 ten-year-old children in ten centers located throughout the city of Birmingham. It had been an integrated program and the young people had gone out in teams and tested some of the

tolerances of the city, successfully and without incident. The participating children were taken to museums, zoos, libraries and a good firm contact was established by the student volunteers with the families of the children in an effort to interest them in reading more at home. The Harvard group made it known that it would be in Birmingham only for that one summer in the hope that the idea of a student volunteer service would start to grow at Miles. During the winter and spring, Harvard arranged for exchanges of visits between students of the two institutions, to encourage Miles students in the idea, and this summer, the Miles students had established a volunteer service group of their own, elected a president and organized a large reading project for ten-year-olds in Birmingham. By the end of the summer, some elements of the white establishment at Birmingham had become aware of the effort of the students and were becoming interested in supporting the use of student volunteers in social welfare efforts in the city.

Discussing the teaching fellow program, Dr. Monro said that Miles has to do a great deal of residual work for students who are basically capable of doing college work but who have not had proper training in English, languages, history, science and in fact, nearly all fields. Last year, two Harvard teaching fellows had worked regularly on the Miles campus in economics and political science and in the trades area and had participated in a careful study of the curriculum. This year, as a consequence of that effort, Miles will be expanding the content of its teaching programs in science, mathematics and English as well as social studies.

Dr. Monro said he felt that part of any job is to instruct graduate students as far along the way as possible and added that a Southern teaching program at Yale has been a big help to Harvard in recruiting people. He felt

that, in the future, Miles has a chance to organize the community of Birmingham and try to develop courses in the summer in English, mathematics, sciences and the social studies for tenth and eleventh graders in high school. He also said that Harvard would continue its efforts to strengthen the college curriculum and to multiply the benefits of the college to the community around it.

Dr. Perry of Florida A & M discussed the program between Florida A & M and Florida State and opened by saying that in 1963, the administration of Florida State was faced with three acute problems. One was the urgency to find ways of enabling Negro high school students to bridge the gap between high school graduation and the college entrance examination. Dr. Perry said that, at one time, Florida had a state-wide examination and, based on the difference in the educational distribution, Negroes had been admitted on a separate score; when this was discontinued, many Negroes were unable to achieve the score necessary to be admitted into college.

The second problem was that more time and more stress should be devoted to individual instruction for the academically talented student who was already enrolled. The third problem was the intense desire of Florida A & M to upgrade its faculty. Assistance in solving these problems had been sought, and a grant had been obtained from the Carnegie Corporation. At about the same time, an agreement was reached by Dr. Gore, the president of Florida A & M, and Dr. Gordon Blackwell, the president of Florida State, for a cooperative program between the two institutions to provide assistance in the development and implementation of the faculty of Florida A & M with advanced degrees, refresher work and research. A joint committee, composed of the two presidents and the deans, made provisions for the upgrading of faculty qualifying for doctoral study and for the encouragement of superior students from Florida A

& M to pursue graduate degrees from Florida State. Faculty had been encouraged to initiate individual research projects by awarding small grants. Dr. Perry said that 40 fellowships will be offered over a period of five years and funds will be allocated for the replacement of faculty nominated for fellowships. The administrative cost of the program is being absorbed by both institutions.

He continued by saying that, to date, eight faculty members have worked towards their terminal degrees and three towards their Master's, and three research grants have been awarded after approval was given by the university research committee. Other arrangements between the institutions include the availability of research and library facilities to the Florida A & M faculty and permission for them to enroll at Florida State as special students for one course per semester at no charge. One problem has been the free mutual exchange of faculty between the two campuses due to the fact that faculty members of Florida A & M feel they are restricted as to the choice of the institution (Florida State), which limits the number who wish to seek the advantages of this program.

Dr. Butler asked for information regarding a cooperative relationship between some five or six institutions in Florida and asked if Florida A & M and Florida State were included in that agreement.

Dr. Perry said he thought not, although there are several situations in which they have cooperative agreements. He said that in the over-all higher education program there are about twelve committees and that Florida A & M is represented equally on these committees. He added that there are two corporations at least in which private and public institutions are joining

in an effort to render mutual assistance.

Dr. Butler said there is another interesting program going on in this area -- the televised course between Cape Kennedy and Florida State.

Dr. Lewis said that Florida State and the University of Florida participate in this program.

Dr. Butler said that this program is interesting in that the research and actual installation, which is non-academic in its function, is participating actively in the promotion of a purely academic activity between the institutions involved.

Dr. Mays asked if there were an exchange of students or faculty between Florida State and Florida A & M.

Dr. Perry said there was no exchange of either students or faculty at present. However, a relationship has been worked out which he hoped would commence next year.

Dr. Branson asked how many Negroes are in the freshman class at Florida State.

Dr. Perry said he did not know.

Dr. Lewis said he could not give the exact amount, but thought about five, however, for a total number of participations, he could state that 92 Negroes had been admitted last year and at some times during the year there had been an attendance of 1933.

Dr. Mays asked whether there were teachers working towards the doctorate

at Florida State and whether they were taking one or two courses or were on full-time leave.

Dr. Perry replied by saying that they are on full-time fellowships at State and he thought the arrangement was that they could go full-time for two trimesters and then if they were needed on the Florida A & M campus, some arrangement would be made whereby they could return to teach a course and pursue their degree program thereafter.

Dr. Parker, discussing the Winston-Salem State-Southern Illinois program said that in April, 1964, the president of Winston-Salem State met a person who is now dean of the School of Education at Southern Illinois. A joint program was discussed and, upon the invitation of Dean Elmer J. Clark of Southern Illinois, a relationship was begun in October, 1964. Dr. Parker said that he and Dr. Kenneth Williams, the president of Winston-Salem State had visited the faculty and administration of both the Carbondale and Edwardsville campuses of Southern Illinois. An exchange visit to Winston-Salem State was made by Dr. Morris, the president of Southern Illinois, and Deans MacKeefry, Clark and Moulton. The purpose of these visits was to discuss possible sources of exchange which would be mutually beneficial to both institutions. The motivating force had been the belief that mutual gains could be achieved by a cooperative program. Dr. Parker said the two institutions constitute a rather unusual and potentially very fruitful pairing of institutions -- alike and yet not alike. Winston-Salem State is relatively small -- 1,200 students -- on a single campus, restricting itself to undergraduate programs and primarily, until three years ago, engaged in the education of teachers. Southern Illinois is quite large, has several campuses as

well as extension operations in this country and abroad, is increasingly engaged in graduate education and has programs in most academic and professional fields. In size, resources and scope and levels of programs, the two institutions seem very dissimilar, but from this disparity comes certain benefits to both -- Southern Illinois can make its considerable resources available to Winston Salem State and the latter can offer scarce, specialized resources to Southern Illinois. Winston-Salem State can also furnish a choice to the student as a counterpart to the multiple diversity.

Dr. Parker said that the two institutions also have a surprising amount in common; twenty years ago Southern Illinois was not much larger than Winston-Salem State is now, and had turned to graduate work about that time. The programs at Southern Illinois, although encompassing most of the academic spectrum, still contain more emphasis on teacher education than is common in most large institutions. The move towards liberal arts, which Winston-Salem State is now beginning to make, was made at Southern Illinois since World War II only. Thus, although Southern Illinois has passed the take-off point and Winston-Salem State may still be short of it, the two institutions are much closer together in heritage, rationale and time than their disparities and current stages of development would suggest. Both institutions also share a common concern for the welfare and economy of their immediate regions as well as a deep and pervasive dedication to the extension of educational opportunity.

The major purpose of the exchange program has been to increase the academic quality of the two developing institutions and to this end, a working committee had been organized and a liaison person appointed on each campus. The first phase of the project terminated in a cooperative planning conference

in June, 1965, held on the Southern Illinois campus. Four faculty members from Winston-Salem State were in residence at that time on the Carbondale campus to assist in the preliminary plans for possible long-range exchange programs between the two institutions. A budget of about \$15,000 was committed by Southern Illinois to support the June conference, but, in addition to this direct allocation of funds, it was estimated that the implicit cost, for which no direct charges to the project had been made, was over \$20,000. Administrative officers from Winston-Salem State visited the Carbondale campus periodically to participate in the planning of the conference, and visits were also made by interested federal agencies and professional associations.

In addition to the June conference, Dr. Parker said, a modest faculty exchange program had been effected. Professor Orville Alexander from the Department of Government at Southern Illinois taught during this summer on the campus of Winston-Salem State, and Professor Sims from the Department of Mathematics at Winston-Salem State taught on the Carbondale campus of Southern Illinois.

The results of the June conference included a statement proposing possible specific exchange programs for which detailed plans for implementation still need to be made. Projects are being designed to increase the academic quality of both institutions and to test the feasibility, through pilot or exploratory efforts, of: (1) faculty exchange programs; (2) guest lecturing, visits and consultations; (3) short seminars; (4) workshops and internships; (5) graduate and undergraduate student exchange programs; (6) student government participation; (7) housing exchanges (8) extracurricular activities; (9) fraternity and sorority exchanges; (10) research exchange programs including research and common development of the geographic areas adjacent to both

institutions; (11) cooperative speech patterns; (12) sociological studies and curriculum development studies; (13) administrative and technical exchanges including library and learning center development projects; (14) intern projects, and (15) consultation and joint faculty recruiting programs and cultural exchange programs including loan of art exhibits, exchange of performing artists in dance, music, theater and other arts.

Dr. Parker said he would also like to mention the Piedmont University Center, which is independent of the Winston-Salem State-Southern Illinois program, but which includes about 17 institutions in Piedmont, North Carolina, which have pooled their resources in many areas in order to share benefits. The center has employed a director.

Dr. Duncan of Livingstone College, referring to this center, said that about four years ago the 17 institutions in North Carolina, 12 white and 5 Negro schools, state, private and Catholic, joined together for the conservation of resources as one objective, and for the extension of educational opportunities as another. The programs of the center have included the employment of outstanding artists, art exhibits, authorities in various fields as visiting scholars, the purchase of library materials at 25 to 30 percent reductions and exchange programs involving students and professors. At present the center is hoping to establish a center library that will house collections that no single institution alone could purchase. The center is also exploring the possibilities of unified admissions to the 17 institutions, although this is a controversial area.

Dr. Zurcher said that although he was not the appropriate person to make this particular presentation since he is connected with the donor, he

wished to talk about two programs -- one of which is known as a college cooperative development program, developed by Dr. Mays, Dr. Duncan, Dr. Colston, Dr. Patterson, Dr. Rufus Clement and some others. The program was based on the suggestion made in the McGrath report that as many as possible of the predominantly Negro colleges should be preserved in the belief that the opportunities to secure resources is growing rapidly. One objective, therefore, of the program is to exploit more effectively all sources of funds and a second aim is to build up the development offices in the member institutions. A desirable feature is that the foundation puts up half the funds and the institutions, of which there are 23 at the present time, put up the other half, thus insuring serious interest on their part in their investment. The funding of the operation is somewhere in the neighborhood of \$100,000, of which \$50,000 has been supplied by the foundation. A small staff, under the aegis of the Phelps-Stokes Fund, has been developed. Two directors are in charge and their responsibility is to unearth ideas as regards sources of funds to help develop proposals and to work with the development officers or presidential assistants of the institutions. There is an ad hoc advisory committee which is representative of the various areas of potential sources of funds; members of the committee include Dr. Butler, Dr. Rufus Clement, Dr. James Colston, Mr King Spank of the First National City Bank, Mr. John Stears of IBM and Dr. Fred Patterson, who is chairman, ex-officio. The two directors are Dr. Combs, who was with UNCF and succeeded Mr. Brown, and Mr. Clifford Welch, who has had some experience in the fund-raising field.

Dr. Zurcher said it was too early to make any kind of evaluation, but he was confident that one of the weaknesses so far has been lack of staff. Up to the present time, the staff had not been adequate to handle the tremend-

ous responsibility placed upon it, and apart from this, effective development officers are scarce. The foundation has taken a good deal of interest in trying to stimulate more private donations to the predominantly Negro colleges, and assuming that government funds and industrial gifts will take care of themselves, the idea of developing some kind of challenge grant to stimulate more alumni contributions is being considered. It is hoped that this can be done effectively by challenging local private donors within the community where the college is situated with a matching grant from the foundation.

Another program Dr. Zurcher said he wished to mention is essentially a scholarship program. In an effort to increase the pool of qualified young men in predominantly Negro colleges in the South, \$100,000 a year for scholarships is being spent at ten UNCF institutions. Young men with an adequate IQ but who are below the acceptably-prepared level are selected carefully for scholarships. Remedial centers have been established at Morehouse and Dillard and a conference was held at Morehouse recently to summarize the remedial programs for junior and senior high school students who were candidates for Morehouse.

Dr. Zurcher said he felt that both these programs would succeed, and that the Sloan Foundation was committed to support them indefinitely.

Dr. Marchese said he wished it to be written in the record that another exchange agreement had been reached this week -- between the University of Pennsylvania and Morgan State, and that the focus of this program would be on urban studies.

Dr. Long said he wished to discuss the Talladega-Dartmouth program and began by saying that Talladega is a conservative small college which feels

if has done a good job over the years. Because of this it felt that whatever relationship it entered into must be on the basis of its interest and needs, and when Talladega had been offered and accepted computer equipment, it was left with the job of developing a program that would be meaningful. For the development of this program, a grant had been received by Talladega from the Carnegie Corporation. The relationship had been established with Dartmouth, with a consultant serving to develop all aspects of the computer program, from the technical aspects of installation to the kind of courses that could be written into the mathematics, physics, economics and sociology areas which related to data processing and data analysis. The relationship with Dartmouth is being conducted by a faculty committee with communication between top officials. Three of Talladega's faculty will be released for year-round study at Dartmouth in computer-related accomplishments and mathematics and physics will be the first areas to be tackled. The relationship will also permit the beginning of some in-service training of staff in the summer of 1966.

Dr. Long continued by saying that Talladega also has a very informal relationship with Fordham, which is more an understanding that Fordham will assist Talladega in the development of the faculty and of the best students to become teachers. Fordham is taking as Ph.D. potential the more promising Talladega students who graduate. It is a consulting arrangement whereby the student is looked at from the standpoint of developing his entire graduate career. Fordham also takes members of the Talladega faculty on the same basis, and this year, one member of the Talladega faculty will be receiving tuition free at Fordham and a presidential grant of a modest amount of money; at the same time, he will serve as a teaching assistant at Fordham in the

7

field of history.

Dr. Long said that Talladega has also been discussing a relationship with Calhoun College of Yale, which would involve students more than the faculty. Both institutions felt that student and faculty exchange programs have not been too productive and are therefore considering the development, through joint planning, of courses that could be offered to both Yale-Calhoun and Talladega students. It might be, Dr. Long said, that these may be courses currently being taught, but the students would be involved in the joint planning of the joint courses and in setting up the reading assignments; the students taking the courses would meet as seminar groups at least once or twice a year. Dr. Long said this would be an expensive project but the fact that students would challenge each other intellectually would be of great value as would the fact that faculty would be involved in the responsibility of the planning and the thinking through of the philosophy of any important course.

Another project which does not relate to any cooperative program, but which Dr. Long said he was anxious to mention, is the program made possible by a grant from the Cline Foundation, a program aimed at the whole question of student learning deficiencies. A major problem is that most schools and in particular the Negro schools, have put great emphasis on rote learning, thus causing a conceptual deficiency in the students. Because of this, admission tests have been used to classify students. The Cline program will develop research to itemize and list the tests taken by the last five freshmen classes in the hope that patterns may be found. First, the items that indicate the highest frequency of failure will be picked out, which will show what the students do not know. Then items will be classified to indicate

the subject matter deficiencies. A more challenging job, however, is going to be to put the subject matter into its conceptual areas. When the analysis is completed, not only the items but the concepts and the areas of deficiency will be fed back into the actual courses to which they relate. Ultimately, it is hoped that they will be fed back into the high schools from which the freshmen came. Dr. Long said that perhaps the program is too modest, but that it is experimental.

THIRD SESSION

THE CONCRETE DIMENSIONS OF COOPERATIVE PROGRAMS

The moderator for the third session was Dr. William Schlatter.

Dr. Agnew of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools said he wished to mention some of the relationships that have been established by the Association. A unique feature of the Association's involvement has been that it has developed relationships between universities and public schools in such places as Nashville, Durham and Atlanta, with two objectives -- one to improve the teacher training processes of the institutions, related particularly to the social deprivation from which the students suffered, and the other to develop in the schools changes that will, in the long run, prevent many of the difficulties being faced at present. The programs are being financed by the Ford and Danforth Foundations.

Dr. Butler asked how many cities were involved in the Southern Association's projects.

Dr. Agnew replied that the project is operating now in three cities, Nashville, Atlanta and the major one in Durham. However, he said, the Association hopes to announce two more within the next six months, followed by a third soon thereafter. He also mentioned a project opportunity which involves sixteen colleges and eleven schools in a cooperative venture. The Association is providing the money and is running the program, which will

ultimately involve about three and one-half million dollars in the next six to eight years.

Dr. Schlatter said that the participants should discuss some of the specific problems which are being faced in the cooperative programs and that he would first make a fast summary of the activities that have been listed and then ask about the specific problems. He felt that the priority of the importance of the different kinds of activities should be discussed, followed by a discussion of chronological priorities. He did this in order that institutions commencing cooperative programs could get some idea of how and where they should begin.

Dr. Schlatter listed the activities as follows:

1. faculty exchange
2. student exchange
3. quality cultural exchange
4. curriculum development
5. scholarships
6. mutual assistance in research -- for example, in the social sciences on human relations
7. library exchange
8. faculty recruitment and development
9. student volunteer service work
10. administrative exchange involving such things as internships
11. recruitment
12. admissions
13. pre-freshman programs
14. post-baccalaureate educational programs

15. master planning including physical plant planning
16. distribution and exchange of information about programs developing in Washington for "parent" and "developing" institutions.

Dr. Schlatter then asked for specific problems.

Dr. Pfautz said that although the Brown-Tougaloo relationship has been one of the more pervasive and intimate programs, it had produced a few problems. One of the first and most general problems had been the almost impossible public relations aspect of the working relationship, not only in the local community but sometimes in terms of the national community as well, because the program was located in Mississippi and difficulties with respect to the kind of image presented to activists in the Negro Protest Movement had arisen. A second problem, he felt, had been that faculty exchange had taken place on a summer or temporary consultant basis only. The Brown-Tougaloo program felt an exchange of no less than one semester was expedient and they hoped that a Brown faculty member coming to Tougaloo would participate as a visiting colleague, order books for the library, participate in faculty meetings, and etc. The question had also arisen as to how to get faculty members interested in research even when grants were offered, when the securing of and arrangements for replacements takes a great deal of planning. A person wishing to volunteer for exchange becomes a nuisance to his departmental chairman, disrupts his graduate work commitments with students and perhaps raises a question of tenure-status. Dr. Pfautz suggested that one prerequisite to any kind of successful recruitment of faculty volunteers is a solid commitment from the president that they would be allowed to go regardless of nuisance value. He said he felt this commitment from

the president right down the line should be a regulation for Title III. In the Brown-Tougaloo program the young people on non-tenure contract are given an extra year in order for the department to make a decision regarding them, but other people, except full and tenured professors, are penalized because they will be holding the same rank for one more year.

Another problem, Dr. Pfautz said, is the fact that young faculty people with degrees from good institutions participate in faculty meetings and help bring about changes in institutions where they are presently working but where they will not spend their entire careers.

Dr. Branson asked what specifically can be done about the "Schweitzer" syndrome.

Dr. Pfautz said that in regard to these people who offer help, Brown-Tougaloo had been rather rigid, because when the program had been announced, there had been an overwhelming amount of national and local publicity and offers of help, and Brown had made the decision that only four regular members of their faculty would be sent to areas specified by Tougaloo next year. The initial discussions regarding faculty who might wish to volunteer had been extremely informal, however, and finally, two biologists, who will teach one semester each, and two chemists had been selected. These professors have already visited Tougaloo and talked to the faculty, looked over the laboratory facilities and ordered books. He said there are a great many details to be seen to before an exchange is finally arranged; an institution has to know considerably in advance and the departments must cooperate in order that the returning faculty can be relieved of teaching duties in the first semester in order to catch up with their graduate commitments.

Dr. Duncan said that although faculty exchange could be a nuisance to the "parent" institution, in many of the Negro colleges it means a diminution of teaching resources for the good instructors to make the move to the predominantly white universities. He asked what is being done in special preparation for the exchange of two professors.

Dr. Pfautz replied that insofar as the Brown-Tougaloo program was concerned, it had not been considered an exchange of faculty -- it had been thought of as Brown faculty members going as visiting colleagues to Tougaloo. So far no attempt had been made to get Tougaloo professors up to Brown, because in the first place the divisional heads already hold doctorates, and, in the second place, the younger members are turning over rapidly. One of the major priorities in master planning is to stabilize the faculty and Dr. Pfautz submitted that it is probably stabilized best at the divisional head level, but he added that there are funds for sending Tougaloo people to graduate school, not necessarily Brown.

Dr. Owens said that Tougaloo is hiring young people with good degrees but they are not interested in sending them off to graduate school immediately because they need to stay at Tougaloo for a few years to gain experience. Because of the turnover in recent years, Tougaloo is not anxious to send people away, especially the divisional department heads who are needed at this particular period to provide stability.

Dr. Clark said he could not agree that the one-to-one exchange or big brother projects -- Northern institution people being sent South -- is valuable. He felt instructors were needed on a full-time basis in the Northern institutions in faculty capacity. He could not see that small institutions would be

weakened in view of the fact that replacements are provided.

Dr. Pfautz said it was not exactly one-way between Brown and Tougaloo for there had been recent graduates of Tougaloo at Brown and possible baccalaureate fellows last year to be followed by more this year. He hoped to be able to discuss later on what he called activities oriented to the development of an established intra-communication between the two institutions.

Dr. Howard said that if the problem being considered was the historic isolation of higher education among Negroes from higher education among whites, then the need for exchange is very important. There is a wide opportunity to supply, through exchange, Negro professors to white universities and white graduate students in large numbers to the Negro universities. One Negro professor sent North and five to ten white graduate students serving as teaching assistants in courses at the instructor or sub-instructor level sent South profit both the Southern and Northern institutions.

Dr. Pfautz said that the faculty at Tougaloo is about 60-40 white at present, and that he thought one Negro is teaching at Brown.

Dr. Howard pointed out the discrepancy in the figures.

Dr. Pfautz said that Tougaloo had become involved in the program because of its concern with the development of its resources and with doing a better job with its students, and that the small grant of \$75,000 from a private foundation had been for underwriting the cost of a ten-year master plan to develop a curriculum for a small college, a physical plant for a small college and an educational plant for a small college. The Brown-Tougaloo program, he said, has other goals -- the creation of Tougaloo as an independent,

economically viable, quality liberal arts college and, in the process, to build in as much exchange and inspiration as possible. The problem in small institutions, he said, is not to encourage people to go into teaching but to encourage them to go elsewhere, which should not be taken to mean that the wish is not to produce quality teachers. The primary concern is to raise the occupational horizons of students so that they will be motivated to going into an occupation other than teaching.

He said that next semester there will be five Brown-Pembroke undergraduates at Tougaloo, as it was felt that one of Tougaloo's needs was to increase the number of white students. However, the question of money to fund the differential in tuition and travel has arisen because parents are not too happy about paying Brown tuition fees for Tougaloo's instruction. On the other hand, Brown would like to have Tougaloo students, but the latter cannot afford Brown's fees.

Dr. Owens said he was not anxious to send faculty members from Tougaloo to other institutions until they had become definitely identified with Tougaloo. The rapid turnover of the younger faculty was the reason that Brown-Tougaloo did not participate in a one-to-one exchange. He stated there is some benefit from visits to the Tougaloo campus by Brown professors who take something back with them from Tougaloo to Brown.

Dr. Butler said that Tougaloo has had a change in administration recently and that there had been some necessity for keeping as many of the good people on the faculty as possible to carry out the program during the transition period.

Dr. Parker reminded the group that in the early discussion of exchange

programs, the idea of a professor going from a Negro college to a larger institution had been given rather high priority, not necessarily for the primary purpose of getting rid of paternalism but, in many instances, for the purpose of having a person who had spent all his undergraduate and teaching years in a small Negro college in the South a chance to develop, to be challenged, to discover his potential and to work in a good laboratory which was well-equipped. He was not to be regarded as a loss to the small college but as a considerable gain to the department upon his return at the end of a year or a semester.

Dr. Brown said that it does not necessarily follow that well-trained and experienced persons are doing the best teaching and he felt that the high priority should be given to good teachers, regardless of race, joining the faculty and evaluating the educational program. The motivation for having a cooperative program should be to reach from one level of education to an even higher one. Tuskegee is interested in knowing whether its engineering program is on a par with Michigan's program and if not, what can be done to raise its level so that Tuskegee's engineers can compete successfully in the engineering market. Therefore, Dr. Brown said, he placed very high priority on the matter of faculty exchange.

Dr. Pfautz said he would not wish to be misinterpreted -- that he was not against faculty exchange but that Brown-Tougaloo had done what they could within the limits of what was possible in view of the large turnover in faculty. Another problem he wished to stress is the large budget needed to cover the cost of travel between institutions involved in the cooperative programs. Another weakness of the program during the last year had been the absence of an inter-faculty committee for constant interchange between faculties, although the

administrations had been in agreement with everything that was being done. Another error the program had made, and which had been reported to the Ford Foundation, was the failure to co-op a small but very vocal group of students involved in the activist end of the Negro Protest Movement.

Dr. Mays asked if the label, "post-baccalaureate year," had presented any psychological block among the Tougaloo students.

Dr. Pfautz said he would say that as far as Tougaloo was concerned, the label was one of the most obvious and meaningful dimensions of the program because it meant opportunity to the individual student.

Dr. Beyer said he felt that this label had posed some difficulty for the students because they did not want to be thought of as undergraduates and had refused to be housed in the Brown dormitories for undergraduates. Although there are some old houses which the Brown graduate students use, the Tougaloo students had been forced by nature of the circumstances to live in one house and, as a result, they became known as the "Tougaloo students" or the "Tougaloo group." He added that in connection with the exchange of faculty, the small number of faculty members at Tougaloo must be borne in mind together with the fact that many of the departments have only one faculty member. He pointed out that during the last academic year, the entire physics department (one man) had been at Brown taking a graduate course; he had not been playing the role of a faculty member at Brown and he will be returning to Tougaloo next year. A man from Harvard will be joining the department next year to make it a two-man department, but neither faculty member would be in a position to increase the integrated commitment of Brown

for both of them are white.

Dr. Rosenhaupt returned to Dr. May's question about the "qualifying year" by saying that the answer is that for some students a fifth year of college is not unattractive. One of the best students from Tougaloo had been offered a qualifying year as an undergraduate at Bryn Mawr and also a graduate fellowship at UCLA; she had gone to UCLA. He said that out of about 30 people to whom a qualifying year was offered, 20 took it in preference to a first year of graduate work. He asked if anyone present could help solve the problem of what to call the year after college, which presumably prepares the student for superior graduate work.

Dr. Nabrit said he wished to address himself to the question of faculty exchange because at Texas Southern it was felt that faculty exchange is very important. He stressed that something special must be happening in the department where the person is going because at the present time there are only a few major departments in the major universities that are enervated and interested in experimentation as well as in terms of basic knowledge of their original discipline. Dr. Nabrit said he preferred Texas Southern teachers to take their exchange at an institution where something exciting is happening, something that could be significant for the program. This is the reason that Texas Southern-Wisconsin program has been kept flexible and in any event, Texas Southern has restricted the expenditure of funds on a one-way street to Wisconsin. He added that two Texas Southern faculty members will be at Wisconsin next year compared with three Wisconsin faculty at Texas Southern. He said it was essential that exchange people need to see what is happening in other universities and they need to participate as a part of the faculty

and understand something of the academic freedom which is almost non-existent in some colleges. These people could then return to their own campuses and perhaps goad some of their administrators into taking a second look at their operations.

In connection with the post-baccalaureate year, Dr. Nabrit said he felt it was important that counseling be done at the institutions for the student to really understand what was involved. He suggested that perhaps it is assumed that young people going through the Negro colleges, which have been highly paternalistic in the past, are as intellectually mature as four years in college would presuppose. He felt counseling in this particular area should be more sophisticated.

Dr. Mays said Morehouse referred to the qualifying year as a post-graduate year.

Dr. Blue asked if anyone knew how best to acculturate students to the environment.

Dr. Summerskill replied that he did not know, for Cornell has not had many exchange students so far.

Dr. Branson said that it seemed to him that some of the exchange programs are building things which are good in spirit but bad in outcome. Students are being encouraged to do graduate work at institutions which they normally would not think of attending.

Dr. Butler restated his feelings about the post-baccalaureate year by saying that there is no graduate school in the country which has any precise measure of determining whether a student will succeed or not. He said that

most graduate admissions offices and departments have dual standards and they do not treat their own undergraduates by the same criteria that they treat students from elsewhere. He felt it was a mistake to label a student on the basis of the institution from which he comes and closed by asking how many postgraduate admission officers were present.

Dr. Rosenhaupt said he had been one for ten years.

Dr. Butler continued by saying he was the second, and that graduate admission officers take a standard criterion, that graduate school departments do the primary admitting and that the administrative officers do the processing. The last year he had been at the university, there had been no less than five categories, all of which could be called post-graduate ratings, and sometimes the student got lost between the various and sundry categories. He felt this plan could not be justified in view of the fact that many young people who had been out of college for four or five years entered graduate school without any post-baccalaureate year on the GI bill and produced some of the very best records.

Dr. Beyer said he would like to point out that the six students from Tougaloo were not at Brown with the idea that they would continue as graduate students at Brown. The idea was that they could better prepare themselves during the year at Brown for further graduate study elsewhere and of the six, only three have shown any interest in continuing further graduate study.

Dr. Gloster said that although the predominantly Negro colleges have many problems, many people have assumed that they have more than actually exist. He asked Dr. Mays if he were correct in stating that one out of every

twenty Morehouse graduates has gone on to obtain the doctoral degree.

Dr. Mays said it was one out of every 27.

Dr. Gloster said this was a rather healthy picture for Morehouse and perhaps if similar figures could be given for other institutions, the same picture would be found. He stressed that Negro students should be admitted or denied admission on the record of performance only. If they do not qualify, they should not be admitted, and should not receive any treatment which is not extended to other students. He asked why, if the post-baccalaureate year is a good thing, it has not been extended to all students who are not adequately prepared for graduate work. He felt the devices such as a summer before a year of fellowship study and the post-baccalaureate year have a number of disadvantages for Negro students and are embarrassing both to them and the institutions from which they come.

Mr. McNeil agreed that students who are capable of entering a traditional graduate program at a traditional university should be admitted whatever their color might be, but felt that this should be looked at from the viewpoint of a Northern university where traditions are very strong and admission standards rather rigid. At Wisconsin it was felt that graduate schools are going to have to change their standards for students who wish to enter but are not adequately prepared. He urged that graduate schools in this country take one step further and involve graduate students in special programs individually tailored for those who pass a minimum test. It was his contention that there are many students in colleges in both the North and South, both Negro and white, who are capable of doing graduate work, of becoming teachers and of earning the doctorate, but who are not admitted to graduate school because of lack of

background and training. He continued by saying that if the number of Negroes and disadvantaged whites who wish to enter graduate school but cannot because of poor training is to be stepped up, graduate schools are going to have to adjust their admission requirements by adopting double standards for perhaps a semester, a year or a year and a half. He hastened to add that the end product -- the Ph. D. -- cannot be a double standard, but there is a transitional period and a transitional group which needs to use this period for special programs, special counseling and special tutorials. He felt it would be very expensive and would probably have to be done at the tutor seminar level.

Mr. McNeil continued by saying that special attention to the special needs of special students should be paid to help them enter graduate school and cited as an example students who wish to enter graduate school but come from colleges where, for example, anthropology is not in the curriculum, and therefore, are not admitted.

Agreeing with the statement that administrative support all the way down the line is necessary to become committed to an exchange program, Mr. McNeil pointed out that if the faculty or the deans or the vice presidents are not interested, the presidents' commitments did not count for very much. The interest had to be on the working level. He said that these exchange programs need a full-time qualified person to manage the program by working inside his own university to find talent and ideas and programs which can be hooked up with the institution at the other end, which means frequent travel to get the best ideas out of the Southern institutions to bring them back to the Northern institution to discuss with the proper people. At Wisconsin, in a relatively small program involving three institutions, there is a com-

mittee of some fifteen men doing an inordinate amount of work. At the Madison campus, there is a half-time person who handles the bookwork, the technical matters and some faculty recruitment. Dr. Howard visits the institution to work with him and the Madison campus, but there is still no real exchange of ideas between the four institutions.

Lastly, Mr. McNeil said he would like to comment on the no-less-than a semester concept. At Wisconsin, after a year's experience, the conclusion had been reached that one of the real resources the university has is the short-term consultation visit. He agreed that there should be some long-term semester and year-long exchange programs, but the short-term programs should be stepped up. Wisconsin would like to tie in with institutes and conference programs focusing on particular problems, and have some massive exchanges back and forth where people from all disciplines could experience Wisconsin and its people, and where people of many disciplines from Wisconsin could get the experience of Southern colleges. He felt that only in this way could both institutions learn. He urged the Office of Education people who will be administering Title III when it is passed to take note of the short-term visitation as being a good influence on both institutions and having a long-range influence because of its tie-in with the longer-ranged programs of exchange.

Dr. Rosenhaupt said the qualifying year program is half Negro, half white, through no design; they were people who were identified as being capable of an additional year of training and took it when offered. Of the 23 who took training last year, 15 won fellowships for their first regular year of graduate work. He said the answer to the question, if summer school is good for Negroes, why is it not also good for whites, is simple -- there

was money for Negro students and none for whites. The Southern Educational Foundation provided the money and it was limited in its charter to graduate schools in the South.

Dr. Gloster asked if a student could get a regular fellowship without taking the other fellowships for the qualifying year.

Dr. Rosenhaupt said this was an option and not a condition as far as he could recall. He felt that too many students were sent to graduate school on Woodrow Wilson fellowships who were not adequately prepared.

Dr. Butler agreed with this but said there must not be a racial division inserted into graduate programs or any other device for classifying and labeling students on the basis of the institution from which they come rather than on the potential of the individual as a person.

Dr. Proctor said that there is a specially prepared brochure on the extraordinary record of Morehouse College.

Dr. Brisbane told the participants the brochure had been included in their kits.

Dr. Patterson said that, from two years of experience in exchange programs, he felt there were two kinds of problems -- one of communication and the other of attitudes, which were so intertwined that it is almost impossible to untangle them. Taking the attitude problem first, Dr. Patterson said that the people who set up programs assume that the problems which arise can be solved logically. The question of pride arises when one top professor from a Negro institution is exchanged for five graduate students from a Northern

institution. As long as the graduate students are graduate students and not Ph.D.'s, not outstanding scholars as yet, the exchange program begins to smack of paternalism, and although this is not a logical idea, it exists. Dr. Patterson pointed out to the Office of Education people specifically that as long as this illogical idea does exist, it is not logical to look at it from any other point of view than that of the Negro college. The smaller institutions, which are usually predominantly Negro, are more easily upset by loss of faculty than the larger ones; it is only nuisance value to a large institution to lose a department chairman or a senior professor for a year or two, but it is a major calamity to a smaller one. If a Negro institution asks for a senior professor from a white institution and sends a senior professor in exchange, the question of pride is resolved but not much good is done, for this has meant a trading of strength for strength and what the Negro colleges need is a building up of their weaknesses. But when they need the assistance of the white institutions to build up their weaknesses, then the big brother idea comes in. He felt that what is needed is the means whereby a big brother could be a big brother without seeming to be so -- which is not a logical situation to have to handle. He said the question of pride exists for students as well as for faculty members.

The number of Ph.D.'s on a faculty is a matter of major importance to a president troubled with accreditation, but if a faculty member is told that he must get his doctorate in three years or move out, he is more interested in whether or not he will have a job in three years than in terms of a Ph.D. for the good of the college or the amount of inspiration it will give his students. In other words, Dr. Patterson said that what a developing institution may define as development may not be what a large institution defines as development,

and, therefore, two institutions finish up working at two different goals, both of which may be equally as good but may not be the kind which will allow them to cooperate. He said the term, "developing institutions," conjures up pictures of poor, struggling institutions, but some of them are not as underdeveloped as they might seem. They may be underprivileged in terms of the problems they have to face, but are not necessarily any more underprivileged than large institutions in terms of the problems they have to face. Lack of communication may make it appear that the two institutions are working at cross purposes when actually they are working for different goals. He felt institutions could get together if the problems could be clearly defined and with the realization that illogical problems are not going to be solved logically. He also said a tremendous amount of communication is needed and the tremendous amount of transportation already mentioned needs to be doubled or tripled in order to communicate and exchange ideas adequately and effectively.

He concluded by saying that most of the problems are really non-logical situations which must be solved with logic, but with logic that does not appear to be logic.

Dr. Nabrit said that some three years ago, a group of about ten Negro colleges received a \$400,000 grant from the Ford Foundation to improve the opportunities for their graduates to enter the State Department and Foreign Service. The project covered grants of \$4,000 to graduates for a year of graduate study in diplomatic relations or political science. The student would then take the State Department entrance examination. Of the first 14 that had entered this project, all except one had passed the courses in the graduate schools at a B level or better, but only two of them had passed the

State Department's entrance examination. The logical thinking, the mastery of the English language, the problem approach to analysis of various issues, which is distinct and separate from rote learning -- had not ever been taught them. He said that Howard has recently taken a large group for pre-law students and are giving them the necessary remedial work so that the students can go into law school and come out first-class law students.

Dr. Nabrit said he did not feel that this fact suggests that the Negro colleges do not occasionally turn out outstanding students who can make graduate school the first time around. What he felt was needed by the large majority of students were some sort of psychological assistance ramps and other remedial procedures which would make it possible ultimately for them to compete on equal terms with those who have had better opportunities.

FOURTH SESSION

THE PROBLEMS AND PLANS FOR THE FUTURE

The fourth session was moderated by Dr. Gloster.

Dr. Gloster opened by saying that when Hampton first began thinking in terms of cooperative progrms, two faculty committees to develop and consider ideas were set up. An attempt was made to get the faculty involved through Hampton's annual educational Staff Institute, which dealt this year with "Possible Cooperative Relationships between Hampton Institute and Major Universities." After a statement regarding the Institute's program by the Director of Teacher Education, Dr. Robinson, and addresses by Dr. Holland, the president of Hampton Institute, and Mr. Lawrence E. Dennis, Director of the Commission of Academic Affairs on the American Council on Education, the faculty had divided into discussion groups to consider recommended programs for undergraduate students, graduate students and faculty members participating in exchange programs, and to consider recommended programs for pre-college students. Another group had considered recommended programs for elementary and secondary school teachers participating in cooperative projects. It had been a most successful institute, ending with reports from the leaders of the discussion groups suggesting lines of activity which Hampton might follow.

Dr. Gloster said that, personally, he felt that major universities, especially through their schools of teacher education, are in a position to make a significant contribution to the upgrading of Negro students by working

as much as possible through the predominantly Negro colleges in the South with elementary and secondary school teachers. He noted that there had not been a single reference made at the conference to a cooperative program designed to work systematically and effectively with elementary and secondary school teachers and said that if the quality of students in the Negro colleges is to improve, it is necessary to improve the quality of instruction in the elementary and secondary schools.

A copy of Expanding Opportunities, which contains an article by Mrs. Beatrice Buszek on the Hampton Cooperative Programs, was passed out to the participants.

Dr. Gloster continued by saying that the Hampton-Cornell program is supported by a grant from the United States Office of Education and involves three types of exchange: student, faculty and administration. In the student exchange, students from each campus will study for a regular or summer session on the other campus. In the faculty exchange, teachers will visit one or more days for lectures or for one or two weeks for seminars or workshops, or they will conduct courses for a regular or summer session. Hampton teachers will have the opportunity to study towards the Ph.D. degree for a regular or summer session at Cornell. In the summer of 1964, Dr. Gloster said, 10 Hampton teachers had been studying towards the doctorate at Cornell, and 10 others had been there this summer. They had been studying on grants which had been supplied jointly by Cornell and Hampton -- Cornell had given the free tuition and fees and Hampton had paid room, board and travel. This particular part of the program had been financed jointly by the two institutions prior to the receipt of the federal grant.

In the administrative exchange, Dr. Gloster said administrators from

each campus will spend up to five days on the other campus for the purpose of conferring with colleagues and for inspecting administrative procedures and difficulties. Administrators from Hampton will also be given the opportunity to study at Cornell.

On each campus there will be a principal investigator -- a director -- and a faculty coordinator, a research associate and two secretaries and the models of exchange developed by the two cooperating institutions will be evaluated by a committee of distinguished educators.

Dr. Perry asked if there were any type of contract for those people receiving grants.

Dr. Gloster said that they are not told they have to come back and teach at Hampton. The grant is given outright to a teacher who is qualified to undertake graduate study at Cornell.

Dr. Perry asked what arrangements are made if a faculty member has almost finished his degree work at another institution.

= Dr. Gloster said that he could go to Cornell to do research on his dissertation. A person may go to Cornell outside the regular academic framework to do independent research or to do consultation work. Under the program, it is possible for an individual to do academic activities other than graduate study, and if a teacher already holds the Ph.D., it is possible for him to go to Cornell to carry on research.

Dr. Colston asked if the program provided for payment of their salaries while they are away studying, in the event they go during the regular school term.

Dr. Gloster said that the Cornell professor receives the salary that he would normally receive from Cornell if he teaches at Hampton, and vice versa. There is considerable imbalance in some cases and the grant allows for payment of expenses related to relocation, in the event he is teaching. In the event he is studying, he receives an outright fellowship, for the grant of \$100,000 is for a 14-month period and is adequate to cover this. The fellowships vary from person to person but are usually around \$5,000.

Dr. Gloster said the Hampton-Cornell program is the only large cooperative relationship that Hampton has, but that it has about five other miscellaneous programs which are quite small.

Dr. Pfautz said he was interested in the model for the grant Dr. Gloster had mentioned and asked if the evaluators would use certain data that had been collected by Hampton or would they just come in and make a considered, expert judgment.

Dr. Gloster said the grant was to develop a model for schools engaging in administrative staff and student exchange and that Hampton would gather as much information as possible as the program got under way. He felt the staff of three was large enough to gather the relevant information which might be subjective as it would come from individuals who were actually participating in the program. Dr. Blue had realized that there would be problems gathering information in a new program such as this as there are few instruments that can be used to measure the effectiveness of what is being done. However, as it is to be a pilot program, the information would be needed for other institutions.

Dr. Branson wondered if all the programs could be looked at with more

fiscal realism. He questioned whether the program Dr. Gloster had outlined could be supported by \$100,000 and felt that perhaps more money had been spent which would show up somewhere in the last analysis. He also requested that the cooperative programs did not get into the area of cooperation with teacher training institutions and education projects. He felt this area should be left to people who are concerned about curriculum reform in teacher education and cited the Physical Science Study Commission, the Earth Science Group and Chem-Study.

Dr. Gloster said he considered it now in order to ask the representatives of the individual institutions to discuss their problems and plans for the future.

Dr. Blue said that when a program is successful, the United States Office of Education sometimes makes grants for the purpose of having it recorded in detail and evaluated and examined so that the experience can be made available to others. The Office makes no effort to conduct these studies unless authorized to do so and the people chosen to make them are either invited or submit a proposal to do so. The research is done by the persons contracted and not by the Office of Education.

He added that he felt Hampton and Cornell have a considerable investment in their program.

Dr. Gloster said he would like to make a few remarks concerning Hampton's projects and plans for the future. Because of limited funds, he said, Hampton had not been able to involve as many students as they would wish. The students who are selected to go to Cornell are the best students and do not usually experience any academic difficulties. Out of 100 students

sent to Northern universities over a period, only 2 have failed to graduate. The main thing disturbing Hampton is whether it will have enough funds to expand the program as it wishes. There have been several meetings with the Cornell members of the Joint Committee in which ideas involving money have been put forward. Next year, the program plans to move into faculty and student exchange in the visual and performing arts -- specifically to take the Hampton Institute Players to Cornell and to bring the Cornell Players to Hampton. Inter-collegiate debates have also been planned, and tennis matches.

Dr. Summerskill said he felt the Hampton-Cornell approach had been much as it would have been in any normal academic enterprise. One problem he saw is the difficulty in fulfilling certain obligations on faculty exchange. Cornell has a considerable number of faculty who are interested in an opportunity to teach at Hampton for a semester, a quarter or for longer periods of time, but who cannot go immediately because of the involvement of other people whose plans have already been made. The Joint Committee feels that it should move ahead to educate faculties on both campuses and formulate plans to enable them to move ahead, however, it realizes that plans for faculty exchange must be made well in advance.

Dr. Rosenhaupt asked Dr. Summerskill if it would be as difficult to recruit exchange faculty if Cornell were dealing with more than one Southern institution, because there are many institutions that might benefit from the presence of Cornell faculty on their campuses.

Dr. Summerskill said that Cornell knew the people at Hampton and could talk freely to them, so that Hampton could be frank enough with Cornell to indicate that a person it had recommended was not needed at that particular

time. He felt that on a wide spectrum of institutions, some of the intimacy would be lost and there would not be a frank exchange and sensible matching up. He admitted, however, that the smallness of the exchange did limit its contribution.

Dr. Rosenhaupt asked what happens to a faculty member who very much wishes to go to Hampton and there is no place for him. Is somebody else approached, he asked, or is his goodwill wasted.

Dr. Summerskill said Cornell was interested in all the goodwill it could get.

Dr. Pfautz said that not only goodwill was needed to get things going, but high commitment on the part of the university, and part of the reason for members volunteering is that it helps their careers. He also felt sometimes that the distance between the institutions was a help and not a hindrance.

Dr. Gloster said that one problem Hampton has had in absorbing staff from Cornell is due to the fact that Hampton did not really have enough time to get ready for the new program. Next year, he felt, Hampton would have adequate time to plan ahead and be able to absorb most of the volunteers.

Dr. Duncan said that time and time again the question has been raised in the conference as to what is the attitude of faculty, and whether the faculty understands its role at an exchange institution. He asked if perhaps some of the participants who had been on exchange could answer this, and, if not, he would recommend another conference at which the students and teachers who have been on exchange programs would participate.

Dr. Gloster said that one of the main strengths of the Hampton-Cornell

program is that it gives Cornell an opportunity to look over a large group of potential graduate students and it gives Hampton a chance to look over and get outstanding Cornell professors. This year, Hampton had given Cornell a list of its vacancies and he felt sure that if the list had been received earlier, Cornell would have been in a position to fill the positions.

Dr. Patterson said, in connection with material he handed out, which was a listing of what had been accomplished in the North Carolina College-Wisconsin program, that the first item involved a considerable number of visits by faculty of Wisconsin to North Carolina College, which were of too short duration. When the workshop meeting had been held at Madison, Texas Southern, A & T College of North Carolina and North Carolina College had suggested that the Wisconsin representatives should stay long enough to look at the particular speciality they were concerned with, and at the college, the community, the relationship between the college and the community and at the strengths the colleges had. The suggestion had been followed and has done much to smooth over some of the difficulties. Another problem solved was in connection with an NDEA Institute for the teachers of disadvantaged children. Wisconsin needed one of the North Carolina College teachers but could not find an adequate substitute at Wisconsin. However, Wisconsin had found a substitute from a Midwestern institution and so they were able to go ahead with the institute.

The five faculty members engaged in long-term study towards the terminal degree either commence or continue their graduate study in September (1965) (four of them started in the summer) with employment contracts from Wisconsin although two only are going to Wisconsin; one is going to the University of North Carolina, one to Pennsylvania State and the other to

New York University. The problem of people nearing their degree at another institution has been solved by Wisconsin stepping aside although the person is technically employed by Wisconsin. Dr. Patterson said North Carolina College should have an additional Ph. D. on the faculty by the second semester, with two more to follow fairly soon, one of them in special education which the State of Carolina is featuring very strongly at the present time.

Dr. Patterson discussed the Cooperative Research Project "English Sequence" by saying that this is a research project which is presently in the proposal stage. It deals in large measure with what students have missed in the conceptual items in the admission tests. North Carolina College has been doing work in this field for the past ten years and has a complete file of what the students have done. An itemized list of the difficulties a student has encountered on the tests is given to the teacher on the student's first day in class. The results are run into a computer and the computer comes out with x number of subject-verb errors or x number of pronoun errors, etc. However, Dr. Patterson said this information does not solve the problem -- it is necessary also to isolate the specific reason which causes the difficulty, and Project English Sequence is basically striving to determine if it is possible to decide what are terminal behaviors for each level of English being taught. One hundred students in a class might score 98 on a test for many different reasons, and the problem is to find out what it is a student must know before he can proceed to the next step. When it has been established what he must know, terminal behavior can be decided, and the decision can then be made whether to teach by program instruction, through closed television, plain lecture or conference, or laboratory session. North Carolina envisions, if and when these determinations are made, a different allocation

of faculty. If it is decided that subject-verb agreement can best be taught by program instruction, one teacher or a team of teachers will be allocated to program instruction, and instead of having 35 or 40 teachers teaching the same thing with nobody listening, there will be one set of teachers handling the program instruction while others are set free to plan something else.

Dr. Branson asked how they could be sure that the students would listen to a machine when they do not listen to a teacher.

Dr. Patterson said they were not sure about this at all, but that they would try to find out whether a thing which has to be repeated over and over is best repeated by a teacher or by a machine, or perhaps they could find some way in which it does not have to be repeated.

Dr. Perry asked if North Carolina College, as a state institution, had any problems created by restrictions or limitations on the degree of cooperation or type of progress in the cooperative arrangement with Wisconsin.

Dr. Patterson said that from North Carolina College's point of view there had been none, but one potential difficulty had been avoided by Wisconsin keeping the money for the project.

Dr. Long asked for clarification of the relationships involved with the faculty members who are away on long-term study terminal degree programs, as he had understood that these faculty members had employment contracts with Wisconsin but are doing work at Pennsylvania State and teaching at North Carolina.

Dr. Perry said these faculty members were not teaching but held study

contracts with Wisconsin to do full-time graduate study. The terms of the grant allow them their salary and board and lodging, which they receive from Wisconsin through the employment contract with money from the Carnegie Foundation funds.

Dr. Long asked if they were actually on contract with Wisconsin.

Dr. Perry replied that they were, as traveling or resident fellows.

Dr. Howard said that there had been problems developing during the past year, first of which has been the evaluation problem. He said Wisconsin is not exactly sure how it should enter into exchange relationships because definite criteria have not yet been established, nor have solutions been reached regarding smaller problems such as the handling of out-of-state tuition and the standards for relocation allowances. He asked what would be a fair and adequate standard to apply and also what would be the proper roles the faculty committees should assume, how should they be related to each other, who should be on them, how should they be formed and what should they do. Dr. Howard also wanted to know what kinds of costs the participating institutions should assume and how far they should go and on what basis. He asked if there were alternative approaches to faculty improvement other than the terminal degree approach and what would be the relative costs of them.

Dr. Howard said that perhaps the most important question is his mind had been how could a pilot effort be made permanent, and what will happen when a grant is exhausted. He also asked how professional development for the Northerner who goes South could be promoted and how could this development be rewarded by his department. He wondered how the Wisconsin programs related to other efforts in the area, for example, to the Woodrow Wilson Teaching

Program, the Southern Association Teaching Program, the NSF Program and the Summer Institutes. He said all these matters have come up and have been discussed, including the question of what Wisconsin could learn from other cooperative programs such as the Cornell-Hampton one.

Another problem, he continued, is that of securing an adequate number of desirable individuals from Wisconsin to go South, because goodwill is obviously not enough to make the faculty volunteer. He felt high priority should be given to discovering ways to interest faculty in going South, perhaps with the promise of rewards and promotions and salary increases.

Looking towards the future of the Wisconsin joint relationships, he said that the joint use of library facilities and special conferences and how they should be related to the Wisconsin Madison campus are undergoing serious consideration. Wisconsin had discovered that there are special collections in Southern institutions such as the murals of John Biggers at Texas Southern and Pennsylvania State that could greatly enrich the resources of Wisconsin; therefore, the possibility of joint uses of special collections had arisen. Wisconsin has just begun to work in the field of radiation and is interested in working out how it would be possible for individuals in another part of the country to engage in cooperative research in this field. The radiation department at Wisconsin is working out a device whereby there would be a place in it on a rotating basis for a conference scholar from one of the participating universities to do research as a colleague with the Wisconsin staff, and, with minimum preparation, scholarly publishable results are almost certainly guaranteed, perhaps leading to the development of NSF proposals which could lead to grants which the individual could take back to his own institution.

Dr. Howard said the faculty member from North Carolina College while at Wisconsin had had a tremendous effect on the university and the possibility of offering graduate instruction in special education jointly, using a department at Wisconsin and a department at North Carolina College to make a better special education program, particularly in the field of mental retardation, for both institutions, had been discussed. Also under consideration are courses on the undergraduate level, particularly Wisconsin's freshman forum program, using one or more professors from the South and one or more professors from Wisconsin, which students from both Wisconsin and North Carolina College could take at the same time. The extension of Wisconsin's educational technology into the community, perhaps all the way to North Carolina, had been discussed for essentially the same problems are involved in all communities. The use of work-study programs under the Economic Opportunity Act in order to make possible the financing of student exchange have been considered and he said he hoped that the first pilot student exchange would commence in September due to Dr. Patterson's efforts.

Dr. Howard said that Wisconsin felt the work in connection with English Sequence being done at North Carolina College is among the most advanced work in this field anywhere in the country. If the work being done at North Carolina College could be satisfactorily linked with what is being done at Wisconsin and a grant of \$200,000 solicited in order to carry on the project, he felt a contribution in English could be made to the entire country. Also under discussion are the standardization of student records and their direct relation to microfilm, the common use of teacher placement facilities and the coordination of baccalaureates out of Southern schools with graduate instruction in the North.

Dr. Howard said he would like to see a consortia of mid-Western universities train 500 Negro Ph.D.'s and only when the goal has this degree of magnitude will things begin to move. He added that he had great hopes for the Higher Education Act of 1965, not only for Section III, but for Section I dealing with urban extension as well. Other items concerning student life and financial problems should be considered. Wisconsin was interested in expanding to include Southern schools in the many institutes that it offers, in fact, he suggested a whole new effort to try to build into the normal operation of Wisconsin participation by Southern institutions.

It is important to consider whether or not these North-South exchanges should take precedence over the regional ones, Dr. Howard said, for although there are many important advantages in having a short distance between institutions, perhaps many more things are done when they are farther away from each other. He stressed that the new educational technology should be taken seriously and asked why permanent telephone tie-lines, closed circuit TV cables linking institutions together, and computer tie-ins could not be used. He felt these devices could make it possible to move ahead to really share and to move from the pilot stages to permanency. To him, the idea of the establishment of regular airline transportation programs, although far-fetched, was important also, for 100 seats a month on one of the airlines would really make a cooperative program meaningful.

Dr. Gloster thanked Dr. Howard for his incisive and imaginative discussion of the Wisconsin program.

Dr. Long asked Dr. Howard to explain how the work-study program is to be used as a basis for student exchanges.

Dr. Howard said that the Carnegie grant had had no money in it for student exchange so that a work-study program at both institutions had been developed as follows: A student at the freshman year level is put through a program of work-study in which he prepares to become a tutor during the first semester for students at his own college. In his sophomore year, he tutors students at his own college and during this time, earns enough money to pay his own transportation costs. During his junior year, he goes to Wisconsin and serves as a tutor for Wisconsin students. It is possible with this kind of service to have the funds to carry the program through with students who are not so well-off.

Dr. Summerskill said he felt many highly productive things could come out of this particular idea.

Dr. Howard said he hoped so and that although there were things that could be accomplished locally, he felt local relationships were relied on too much and that there were important advantages to having inter-regional relationships also.

Dr. Summerskill said he had been impressed by one of Hampton's approaches in that the Board of Trustees had made it clear from the beginning that Hampton would have working relationships with more than one institution, setting a pattern for growth in a number of directions. He felt this could be the basis for a model for patterns to follow. He also said that although some close ties are important, they must be weighed against the benefits of an exclusive relationship.

Dr. Patterson said that the work-study programs pay \$1.50 an hour,

allowing students to make approximately 7/8ths of their expenses at North Carolina College, which now has 50 students in the operation.

Dr. Gloster said he wished to point out that Hampton and Cornell have used the tele-lecture system under which a lecture can be brought to Hampton or Cornell for the cost of a station-to-station telephone call. He recommended this sytem for involving professors who are reluctant to travel to institutions that wish to have lectures and discussions involving two participating schools.

Dr. Mays asked Dr. Patterson if he saw the relationship between Hampton and Cornell, Wisconsin and North Carolina, as one sure way of increasing the number of people with doctorates on the faculties of small liberal arts colleges. He was asking the question, he said, because he felt it was useless to expect more than the usual number of Ph.D.'s to be produced each year, taking into consideration the inroads made by government and industry.

Dr. Gloster said that at Hampton they were tackling this in three ways. First through the Cornell-Hampton relationship, Hampton faculty without certain degrees are able to move more rapidly towards them. Secondly, Cornell is directing young Ph.D.'s and Ph.D. candidates to Hampton, and thirdly, Hampton will be receiving a number of visiting professors, outstanding scholars and holders of the doctorate. He felt the latter fact was one of the most beneficial parts of the Hampton-Cornell exchange.

Dr. Blue said he felt the exchange program will help identify bright students who show interest in scholarship, and it should not be only a matter of upgrading present faculty.

Dr. Howard agreed with Dr. Blue that it should not be a case of the

Negro colleges merely being able to quote a larger percentage of Ph.D.'s on their faculty. He wondered if Dr. Mays were asking, parenthetically, how Morehouse and Wisconsin could cooperate so that Morehouse could produce more Ph.D.'s.

Dr. Gloster said that Cornell is very much interested in Ph.D. material and would still be interested in potential graduate students even if there were no available funds in the program. He stressed this point.

Dr. Mays said that although he agreed with Dr. Howard in a way, colleges with faculties of 20 to 25 percent Ph.D.'s degrees do not have such a good chance with a regional rating board as those colleges with 30 or 35 percent.

Dr. Marchese said that although it was important for participants to talk about programs and to get ideas on how to expand programs, he hoped there might be some further discussion of the relative place of inter-institutional agreements within the spectrum of expanding opportunities of higher education. Saying that there were 123 predominantly Negro institutions and, by estimate of the American Council on Education, 200 colleges and universities in the country having the capacity to aid other developing institutions, two years after this exchange device had been recommended as a means of expanding opportunities for Negroes particularly in the South, only 10 or 11 of these exchange programs are taking place. If they were a device for bringing about changes and improved educational opportunities in the Negro colleges, Dr. Marchese said he felt the place had been reached where the way to bring about more exchange programs should be discussed. Evidence that some of the exchange programs have not met their initial expectations and that some institu-

tions have not sent one single faculty to other institutions has concerned him. Some institutions have not been able to persuade their faculty members to volunteer to go South and he wondered what institutional arrangements take place whereby one institution can get faculty involvement and another cannot.

Saying that exchange agreements, with the exceptions of the ones in Florida and Tennessee, are North-South arrangements, Dr. Marchese wondered if this were the wisest approach. There are questions of proximity, accessibility and even understanding that mean that the primary job in the exchange agreements will have to be assumed by Southern universities, because the primary concern of Northern institutions should be with themselves and not with predominantly Negro colleges. As an example, he said that the first job of Wisconsin-Milwaukee is not North Carolina College but Wisconsin-Milwaukee, and increasingly it is going to be under greater and greater pressure to put more time, money and other resources into itself. He said he did not see how much of a commitment Wisconsin could ultimately make to predominantly Negro institutions in the South.

Dr. Marchese said there was no solid evidence as yet of change occurring in either the institutions which are providing the aid or the institutions which are receiving it, and, therefore, trying to solve the problem through the medium of exchange is perhaps not the wisest use of resources. He suggested that spending time and money on faculty institutes, post-baccalaureate programs, summer programs prior to the baccalaureate degree, the student teaching programs and the Woodrow Wilson Foundation program might be more helpful. He said that although Dr. Howard had asked a question about the relationship of the programs to these other things, nobody had actually answered it. He thought the question must be asked whether the wisest use of re-

sources in higher education is to spend time on the faculty exchange program, especially when great distances between two institutions are involved.

Dr. Marchese felt the question was what is in the exchange agreements for the Northern universities, adding that he did not think some of them had thought through the idea clearly enough. He suggested that perhaps so far the programs had been carried on by altruism, questioning whether this could last long in view of other priorities and demands and saying that it was apparent that altruism alone has not been enough to get good faculty members to go South. He said the question of what is in it professionally for faculty members to move South still has not been answered. He felt Northern institutions should think very seriously about a long-term commitment to institutions far away.

Every exchange program represented at the conference involved a predominantly white university and a predominantly Negro college and apart from the MIT-Oklahoma City agreement, Dr. Marchese said, he knew of no agreement among very strong white universities and very small, weak, white colleges, suggesting that the impulse behind the exchange programs has been racial. He asked the Office of Education people if, in administering Title III, they had any expectation that, for example, Indiana University which is very willing to work with Spelman, would also be prepared to work with one of the little white colleges in Indiana or one of the state colleges, or if they thought that a faculty member from the University of Chicago would go to some little college in Illinois or even to Chicago City Junior College on an exchange basis.

Dr. Butler said these observations were good and were needed for the record of the meeting. He said that although 800 colleges in the country

might be designated as disadvantaged, some Negro institutions certainly would not fall into this category and could very well be in a position to be a big brother to some of the local white colleges. He said he was aware of consortia in the parochial arrangements and that one university, Nevada he thought, has an arrangement with all the small colleges in the state. However, geographically, most of the Negro institutions are located in the South and cannot change their location. He noted the significance of the Yale Southern Teaching Fellows in the Miles program mentioned by Dean Monro of Harvard and said it is benefiting Harvard, Yale and colleges in the East and increasing communication between them. He added that he could see Brown, Harvard, Cornell and Yale together at the conference talking about programs, something they had not done so far in Providence.

Dr. Butler said that the Northern disadvantaged, white and Negro, have not had entry into the higher educational structure at the level they should have had, but when Negroes are involved it becomes dramatic and Congress pays attention to it. He said that, in all probability, more Negro students would be going to college and on to graduate study from Atlanta, Georgia, than would from Detroit, Michigan. One thing that happened when Michigan and Wayne State and the Big Ten schools become interested in cooperative relationships is the development of programs in their hometowns. Wayne State did not have a higher educational opportunity committee until it became involved in the cooperative arrangement; Wisconsin did not have a Human Relations Office until it became involved. He said he had heard Dr. Howard ask Dr. Pfautz how many Negro faculty there were at Brown but that he had not heard a reply. Another thing being learned is that the mileage between the universities and their alumni, who are the faculty members of the Southern colleges, is decreasing.

Another and more abstract value is that the regions have been parochial, Dr. Butler said. The Westerners are proud of the California system, the Ivy League is proud of the Ivy League and the Big Ten is proud of the Big Ten, but there has been very little communication between them and very little communication between the major elements in the educational structures and the small colleges. However, he said, things are beginning to happen now in the East and West which are doing a great deal that cannot be overlooked in terms of value.

Dr. Long said that Mr. Marchese had thrown out a clear challenge to the group and asked whether it would be profitable to answer it.

Dr. Gloster said he would like to make a brief comment on Dr. Marchese's statement by saying that Cornell, Hampton, and the Office of Education people who worked on the program, hope that the Cornell-Hampton program will provide a model of reciprocal enrichment that will benefit not only the predominantly Negro colleges but also other colleges and universities without regard to race, religion or region; in other words, that it will be useful to any American college and any American university working in a cooperative program. He said, with reference to the establishment of possible relationships with Southern universities, that the arrangements between Knoxville and Tennessee, and Florida State and Florida A & M are unique.

He continued by saying that Hampton has not yet been able to establish the kind of rapport with the University of Virginia that would enable Hampton to enter a program comparable to the one with Cornell, one reason perhaps being that Negro teachers at the University of Virginia would not be welcome at the present time as compared to Cornell which is willing and ready to accept them.

He said he did not feel that the student exchange program would be acceptable to Virginia either.

Dr. Gloster said that Hampton has been trying to establish a closer relationship with the College of William and Mary by suggesting a cultural exchange -- plays, musical performances and debates, etc. -- although this has not yet come about. He mentioned that although the College of William and Mary conducts a debating tournament each year, Hampton has not been invited to it in spite of the fact that Hampton has always invited the College of William and Mary to theirs. Dr. Gloster felt that when the possibility of cooperative arrangements between Southern universities is discussed, the racial situation in the communities must be taken into consideration. He said that Hampton has a closer relationship with Duke University and the University of North Carolina than it has with the University of Virginia, and that it would be willing and able to serve as a big brother to any of the small, predominantly or all-white colleges in Virginia. A Newport News branch of the College of William and Mary has a very small collection of books in its library and its students have been using the library facilities at Hampton.

Nearly all these things have racial implications, Dr. Gloster said, but he was surprised to hear the attitude of the American Council on Education concerning the exchange agreements. Shortly after the meeting in the White House between President Kennedy and 200 leading educators in June, 1963, to urge increased educational opportunities for Negroes, the American Council on Education had promised the President to further the cause of educational opportunity, immediately implementing this pledge by appointing a committee on equality of educational opportunity and requesting all Council members to work vigorously towards securing equal rights for all Americans. Dr. Gloster continued by

saying that in 1963 the Council had called a meeting of 40 selected national leaders in the field of education to formulate a program to improve opportunities for Negroes in higher education and had published Expanding Opportunities which describes and encourages the exchange programs.

Dr. Marchese said he had written the book, but that his comments could not be taken on behalf of the Council for nobody speaks for the Council except the Board of Directors. He said there are possibly one hundred things that can be done in the expanding opportunities field and he felt it was high time, after two years and a great deal of experience, to ask what are the things that, given resources, time and money, will be the most efficacious in bringing about the desired results.

Dr. Howard agreed that hard questions about exchange agreements should be asked but said that higher education is under the control of the establishment, and this establishment has not included the participation by Negroes with a spirit of being Negroes. He felt that it was difficult to relate to Negroes because of lack of experience in relating to them through the years, but the relationship with North Carolina College has helped Wisconsin to learn how to integrate. However, he said, if Wisconsin believed that quality education must be integrated education, it would be denying its white students quality education because there are no Negroes at Wisconsin.

Dr. Long said he did not wish to enter into a debate but that he had been excited by the challenge of Dr. Marchese's statements and had hoped they would be explored even though no conclusions were reached. He asked Dr. Marchese if he had meant to imply that one of the difficulties is that there are racial motivations and objectives and that the most promising path in the

future lies in either the separation of these motivations and objectives from each other so that programs could be more solidly and consistently formed, or the understanding that there is a combination of interest and motivation which has to be accepted and made the best of. He said he believed that there are some very real alternatives in the things Dr. Marchese had mentioned.

Dr. Pfautz said that in the Brown program the motivation is strictly educational and that some of the issues mentioned during the conference did not apply to Brown. Many of the things done in the Brown-Tougaloo program so far have been minor, but, in the coming year, a master ten-year plan for Tougaloo for the development of a quality liberal arts college will be organized. Money is needed for Tougaloo to expand physically, but he said, all colleges need money and he would hope that the Office of Education would select model colleges to receive the money from Title III -- not pour the thirty million dollars all over the country.

Dr. Gloster said he felt that what was being discussed was important, but that the participants should go on now to discuss problems and plans for the future.

Dr. Brown said he might be considered naive in feeling that Tuskegee-Michigan had not had the problems being discussed during the conference because an appreciable amount of the things set up in the memorandum of agreement had already been accomplished. One problem, a major one, is the lack of money to move ahead as quickly as they wish.

Tuskegee has relationships with a number of institutions, including a research program with Baylor University and one with Howard and Emory jointly, he said, and he felt large universities certainly could benefit from coopera-

tive programs. Michigan is very active in two research programs that are based in Tuskegee and recently has asked permission to use Tuskegee's large animal facilities for studies in physiology. The Tuskegee-Michigan relationship had been set up on a two-way street basis and the first thing that had taken place was a sociological study by Michigan at Tuskegee.

Referring to the willingness of unwillingness of faculty people to move back and forth, Dr. Brown felt it was primarily a matter of the availability of people, for although Michigan was large it probably had vacancies at some time or other which even it could not fill. He said although it was not easy to move people, it was not impossible. Tuskegee had had a top professor from the Michigan Engineering School for a full semester who had said that Tuskegee had adequate facilities for his research program. He had worked with two Tuskegee graduate students and had awarded one Master's degree at the end of the summer commencement. Next year, a philosophy professor from Michigan would be spending an entire year at Tuskegee. Dr. Brown said he felt some participants were too pessimistic about arranging faculty exchange.

Dr. Colston said he wished to comment on Dr. Mays' statement regarding the production of Ph.D.'s. In the Knoxville-Tennessee relationship, one Ph.D. was produced last year, by the end of the first quarter of this year there will be another, by the summer quarter of next year another, and within a year and a half, at the least, three more. He felt there was real value in proximity relationships when they can be arranged.

Dr. Messier said he wished to mention that these exchange programs offer fantastic opportunities for schools to engage jointly in research of

a kind not possible in the past. There are possibilities for creative efforts to bring forth interesting research projects which would surely have the consideration of the Office of Education.

Dr. Davis said that Dr. Marchese's remarks related to the number of programs which have come into existence within the last two years. Ten or fourteen is a relatively small number in relation to the number of institutions that could profit from this type of relationship, if a cooperative arrangement is a valid way of solving their problems. He offered the suggestion that perhaps the reason there are not more programs is that the institutions who could engage in them have no way of becoming involved together or of finding each other and asked if it would be possible for the American Council on Education or a similar organization to serve as an intermediary and let it be known that it would receive applications from potential partners on both sides and thus perform a national service.

Dr. Marchese said this would be possible and that, for the record, a Northern institution was seeking an arrangement at the present time. While he had been in Atlanta he had been told about a school that would like to cooperate with a Northern institution and felt that some agreement between them could be reached fairly quickly.

Dr. Gloster said in some instances the approach for an agreement has been made by the predominantly Negro colleges, as illustrated by Tougaloo's approach to Brown. There is also the case of the white university approaching the Negro college, illustrated by several instances and the approach by interested outside parties, for example, the bringing together of Stillman College and Indiana University by Dr. Dennis.

What is actually needed, Dr. Gloster said, is a systematic bringing together of representatives of white universities and Negro colleges in order to promote this type of relationship and to give the schools that are interested the opportunity to enter such relationships. So far there has been no national effort, but when there is, he felt that many more cooperative programs would be initiated.

Dr. Monro said he would like to remind Dr. Marchese of the two problems which need to be solved. The first one is the race problem, which is bitter and tough and which affects Harvard as much as it affects any other institution. All white institutions need to learn how to relate to the Negro communities in this country. He agreed with Dr. Howard that by working in the exchange programs in the South, Northern professors had learned how to relate to Negroes in their home communities. The second problem is communication, which is closely tied in with race relations. He believed some solution of racial problems will be found in the area of higher education, which already is reaching for a way to halt the pulling apart of educational opportunities. Although the big and powerful schools are moving ahead quickly, the small schools and colleges are tied to a post and educational opportunities are becoming more and more unequal. The issue is not only money but poor communication as well. He felt the stage had been reached where people have to move from one place to another to find out what is going on and this can be done only by relationships between institutions that are quite different in outlook and location. Only when this type of relationship has been worked out satisfactorily should large sums of money be spent. He felt the racial separation in the country should be attacked, because there will be enormous benefit to both races by coming together, understanding each other and working

together to solve the terrible pulling apart of educational opportunities. Exchange programs, he said, are not the only way to accomplish this, but they are one way and certainly one of the most promising.

Dr. Manley said he was interested in the statement that relationships should be made not only between Northern universities and predominantly Negro colleges, but between Northern universities and good, small white colleges as well. He said certain persons in the predominantly Negro colleges could make contributions to the larger white institutions and they should be identified in order to offer help to other universities and colleges. He felt the program should be thought of in terms of bringing some very good small colleges into it and also of outstanding persons being brought in who could make contributions to other institutions.

Mr. Miller said he did not feel the proposition was an either/or one with regards to distance because there is room for both kinds of relationships. One comment which had not been made of the advantages of a relationship in the same community is the long-range outcome. Different parts of the South are changing at different rates of speed and if a relationships can be established between two institutions, one Negro and one white, it may be that other relationships may be established between professors etc. which could last long after the formal project had ended.

Dr. Gloster said that one of the most encouraging aspects of the conference had been to hear of the situation between Knoxville and Tennessee and between Florida State and Florida A & M. Dr. Gloster then read the statement made by Dr. Dennis during the National Conference on Higher Education in Chicago in 1964, as follows:

the emerging dialogue between the predominantly Negro institutions and the predominantly white universities (which President Kennedy called for in June) should be supported as a constructive step toward the improvement of all higher education.

Dr. Gloster closed the session by thanking Morehouse College for its hospitality and the Office of Education for arranging the meeting and for taking care of expenses.

FIFTH SESSION

SUMMARY

Dr. James Colston acted as moderator of the fifth and last session.

Dr. Colston opened the summation session by asking those people who had made presentations to leave copies of them with Dr. Brisbane.

Dr. Colston said that in terms of the principal objectives of the conference, things had gone well; experiences had been shared, problems discussed, and plans for the future outlined, and a considerable amount of factual information on the history, administrative organization and the operational aspects of existing programs had been gained.

As summaries had been made as the meetings progressed, Dr. Colston felt it was unnecessary to summarize again and suggested that a few individuals be asked to make short statements regarding the conference.

Dr. Dunbar said he had learned a great deal from the sessions and that it seemed important to him that participating institutions should find a certain amount of self-interest in order that the relationships could survive. He agreed with Dr. Monro that the two chief problems in higher education facing America today are the racial question and the communication difficulty, but that he would like to add a third -- the artificiality of values existing within American universities today. Saying that much of what goes on in research on campuses at the present time is relatively unimportant, Dr. Dunbar said that the standards of scholarship have become so low and the criteria of

quality become so bad that the plight of the Northern professor who says he cannot go South because of his research work cannot be taken seriously. He felt there must be a distortion of values within the academic community when a philosophy, political or social science scholar cannot see that he can mature and deepen equally as well at Talladega or Tougaloo as he could at Cambridge, that is, if he is really studying the mind of man or the political process of how human beings live with each other. In other words, Dr. Dunbar said, the discovery is painful to Americans that it is impossible to solve the problems of race without altering the institutions of American life to some degree, and for the universities to think they can make substantial contributions in this field without, in some measure, changing themselves is a fallacy.

Several times during the conference the question of paternalism had come up, Dr. Dunbar said, and although what the white institution can get from the Negro institution is quite different from what the Negro institution can get from the white institution, this is not always a racial matter. He felt the answer to paternalism lies in frank dealings and clear understandings of values and interests, and the dropping of the stereotype of what all Negro colleges are like. There is great variation among Negro colleges, he said, some of them are very good, which fact is only slowly getting across to the rest of the country. He said he saw some value in cooperative agreements being made between equal institutions, both of whom would stand to gain from each other, and cited Fisk and Vanderbilt as an example. In a general sense, he believed that the value of exchange programs lies in the increasing and enlarging of the strength of the Southern institutions. He felt the student exchange programs are valuable but that the important objective should be to try to make a reality out of the need for Negro colleges to be improved and

that their improvement within the framework of exchange programs should be measured against what contributions the programs make to the institutions and not to the students.

Although he agreed that all colleges in the South need to be kept in existence and improved, he said that state policies in the South should be carefully looked into before cooperative agreements were entered into by state colleges. He also stressed the value of agreements between Southern institutions such as Tennessee and Knoxville. Dr. Dunbar said that Southern foundations should be approached and interest stimulated because several of them are quite able to make valuable contributions, adding that Southern foundations have been the most irresponsible of all American institutions during the recent critical years. He felt that the post-baccalaureate year should be viewed with some skepticism and he agreed with Dr. Monroe that the important question a university has to answer is not who comes in, but what comes out. It seemed to him unrealistic that universities should pride themselves on their graduate school admission standards, for what a university should do is produce good Masters and Doctors regardless of the name given to students while studying.

Dr. Dunbar said he had been impressed by remarks made by other participants that cooperative agreements should be viewed within the framework of other ongoing programs. He felt that the American Council on Education -- or some similar body -- could furnish a great service by reporting continuously on the variety and span of programs, so that they could be related to each other.

Finally, he said, he wished to comment on Dr. Nabrit's remarks about the effect of cooperative programs on academic freedom. There are reform

movements going on at many campuses at the present time, which may or may not be liked, but the programs under discussion during the days of the conference will be moving forward in this climate of radical questioning of the quality of work being produced by the best institutions in the United States. The work of the University of California is being questioned more than the work at Tougaloo, but reforms are going forward in Southern colleges in the same atmosphere, and attention should be paid to them.

Dr. Marchese reiterated that he did not speak for the American Council on Education for there has been no change in its attitude towards exchange programs, but that he, himself, was more prone to understand more about them after two days attendance at the conference. He felt the Council would be engaging more actively in the programs when the new director of the Commission on Academic Affairs begins work, for he is a person already deeply involved in this field. Dr. Marchese said one of his problems had been trying to comprehend what is going on all the time in view of his almost non-experience. However, he said, he did know something of great import is happening in American higher education at this time and that exchange programs are part of the whole expanding opportunities effort. Many of the people who are in this field are already oriented and operating on a kind of ad hoc or split-term basis, but he felt that the full thought of what is going on and what it means is still missing. Three or four of the major components of higher education's expanding opportunities have been adopted by the federal government, including the scholarship and developing institutions bill, and money is available. The pre-college programs have been taken care of by Operation Headstart and next year will receive 23.8 million dollars for 200 pre-college programs in the summer instead of the 20 or 30 which were held this year.

He stressed that too little thought has been given to the exchange program area and that hardly any articles have been written about the expanding opportunities field. He urged the participants to write more about what is being done and speak to other educators about it, for there is a gap in this kind of information which the people involved in the field of exchange programs have an obligation to fill. He said the conferees should keep in touch with the Committee on Equality of Education Opportunity which will help by printing articles on cooperative programs. The Committee would like to receive copies of any material written about programs, even though it is not for publication, and the information, aside from any confidential material, he said, can always be seen in Washington and questions asked and an effort made to answer them.

Dr. Miller said he wished to inform the participants that the Southern Regional Education Board has recently taken official action to initiate Board-sponsored programs in the area of the predominantly Negro colleges. The SREB is a unique agency, he said, in that it is an instrument of 15 Southern states, entered into by state legislatures and supported by annual appropriations from them, and interests itself in both public and private higher educational institutions. Its conferences, workshops and seminars have involved people from all institutions regardless of race for the last 15 years, so that the special interest in Negro education taken by the Board is not an innovation. The action was taken in two ways; firstly, a commission drawn from the membership of the Board, was established to look into the question of predominantly Negro institutions in the region. The project will extend over a couple of years and most likely will produce a document comparable to the SREB Goals Commission Document, which outlined in broad fashion goals for Southern higher education in the region as a whole. The commission will

thus be able to look into the long-range picture and find what place the predominantly Negro institutions can take in the region in the future.

Secondly, the Board directed the staff of SREB to enter into such activities as seemed appropriate by way of individual projects relating to the predominantly Negro institutions. Dr. Miller then asked the participants at the conference to write to the Board giving it their ideas and suggestions. He said the Board does not want to duplicate what has already been done but feels it is in a unique position to venture into something new.

Dr. Miller said it had been abundantly clear during the past two days that there are a variety of problems, and a suggestion had been made that by talking together the problems could be solved, and that the best ways to pursue institutional cooperation would be worked out for other institutions to follow. He felt this should not have been expected. He stressed the need for communication about the kinds of programs that are in progress, for if communication beyond what has been done in the conference is developed, a great deal can be learned. More can be learned from the regulations which will be a necessary part of the federal participation in the financing of these programs under the Higher Education Act, and this, he felt, would bring greater standardization to cooperative programs. However, he stressed that there must be an awareness of the necessity for variety and flexibility in any arrangements. He felt it was not necessary to argue the merits of one-to-one or group relationships or North-South or South-South relationships, because each particular set of problems involved a particular institution or institutions and calls for an answer tailored to the particular situation. He felt that knowledge of how other institutions had organized their programs and have operated will be extremely beneficial and help to avoid repetition of

mistakes, which does not mean that institutions should follow the programs of other institutions right down the line. He felt imagination will have to be used to develop programs that fit the situations.

Dr. Proctor said that throughout the meeting he had been thinking of the first conference called on this topic and how gratified he was to see how far things had progressed. He felt that the objective of cooperative arrangements is so valid that mistakes have a right to be made. Since 1955, when the United Negro College Fund had asked for money to support Negro colleges, these colleges have moved ahead. He felt that what was needed today was an effort to make these colleges even stronger for there will be many young people wishing to enter them in the future, and education will be better off with these colleges being strong and doing their job well than it would be without them. He said he is hoping for the day when there will be no such thing as a "Negro" college, and by making the present ones stronger, the term "Negro" college will become an anachronism.

Dr. Rosenhaupt said the heavy, intelligent and committed participation of the federal government appears to him as worth noting in the summarization. The presence at the conference of people such as Dr. Blue and Dr. Butler was an example of the federal government's interest in learning from the people involved in doing good jobs with federal money.

Due to some of the discussions he had heard at the meetings, Dr. Rosenhaupt said he thought three changes needed to be made in the internship program. One unanswered question which was still troubling him, was the one regarding the recruitment of faculty personnel. In the internship program, he said, exchange programs had been announced in a very low voice, but he felt

there was merit perhaps in tackling the faculty a little more forcibly. The question of what to do with faculty goodwill which is generated but for which there is sometimes no use concerned him as well, for in the internship program there had been 180 volunteers and placement for only about 40 of them.

Dr. Rosenhaupt felt the question of paternalism deserved discussion and treatment in an effort to avoid the heavy foot of a large institution in a relationship between it and a small institution. He also noted the unsolved problem created by the absence of a faculty member from the campus and suggested the possibility of tying in some of the inter-institutional exchange programs with ongoing programs, whereby the departing faculty person could be replaced for a certain length of time by a teaching intern. He said he agreed with Dr. Miller that it is not necessary to answer the question whether it is preferable to have relationships between institutions miles apart or in the same locale. He felt an attempt should be made to answer the problem of how to evaluate programs but it was more important to him to get on with the programs now and look at what has been done later. The final problem, he said, is how to make sure the money is given to the correct place and people.

In closing, Dr. Rosenhaupt said he could not begin to stress the importance of personal ties and relationships, which, in most instances, have been at the bottom of good cooperative arrangements. He said he was reassured to see the people from Washington attending the conference, for they are members of the academic community although based in Washington. He then expressed indebtedness to the organizers of the meeting.

Dr. Spivey said the first comment he wished to make was not in connection with the value in cooperating with a neighbor that might accrue to the university, but with the value that might accrue to the country as a whole,

for in regard to cooperative programs he felt a small amount of money goes a long distance. Another value he wished to mention is the favorable influence a cooperating university can have on its environment, an influence which could make a difference in the climate of opinion and the value systems of its constituency. Saying that it is also the duty of a university to attempt to educate its trustees and legislatures, Dr. Spivey suggested that perhaps this influence might make a difference in the way in which a university is operated. He said that cooperative programs can also enlarge the inner world of the members of the faculty.

Dr. Spivey said that cooperative programs increase the capacity of a university to do desirable things and gave as an example a project on which Tennessee is working. He said that Tennessee is offering consultant services on a Southeastern regional basis to help school boards, superintendents, counselors and teachers to operate within the changing environment, and although Tennessee has good psychologists and sociologists on the faculty, there are many things Tennessee does not know how to handle and so it calls on Knoxville colleagues for help.

He closed by saying that cooperating successfully and extensively with institutions of different kinds in the immediate environment provides a very fine atmosphere in which students may experience value reorientation, for he believed one major purpose of an undergraduate college should be to bring about value reorientation.

Dr. Colston said that during the conference it had been said many times that the programs which get under way quickly and effectively are those that have not only presidential sanction but presidential direction as well. He then asked Dr. Keeney to make his comments.

Dr. Keeney said that this conference differed in some respects from the conference held last year, in that this year the participants had been more frank, less careful about other people's sensitivities and also that they had had much more to talk about, although he wished there had been more to talk about by way of accomplishments.

If the cooperative programs are to be effective, he said, there must be a wide commitment by both institutions, and it must be an institutional commitment which is gradually able to get to the hearts of problems. The programs must be conducted with mutual honesty and if there is a big brother aspect to them, this aspect must be faced.

He questioned the accuracy of the assumption that if the faculty of the predominantly Negro institutions is improved, the problem is solved. At Tennessee they had had more of a problem upgrading the administration than the faculty, he said, and he would like to see the pool of people interested in becoming competent administrative officers in Negro colleges enlarged. He felt inexperience in planning and lack of good statistical control in most small colleges deny them the chance to identify where they are going. The most they can do is examine and identify what and where they are now, and although it is a difficult thing to do, a plan for future development should be mapped out. Few colleges have an adequate development program and even fewer have an adequate staff to carry on development activities, so that one of the most useful things a large institution can do for a small institution is to lend it the surplus energy of its development staff and train development people with it. Few institutions have an adequate building staff and a solution to this, Dr. Spivey said, is regional planning for building. He said it would make no difference whether the building planning and development

training were operated by foundations or came under the Higher Education Act.

Dr. Spivey said he wished to question also that only higher education should be attacked, because he felt elementary and secondary education should come under fire also. He said he would like to see regional clusters of various kinds of colleges, and predicted that, within a short space of time, there would be clusters of white, Negro and mixed colleges. He believed that what had already happened in Atlanta might be the basis for the earliest clusters to mature. He would like to see strong Negro colleges helping weak Negro colleges, but when the point is reached where strong Negro colleges also help weak white colleges, the problem will have been solved once and for all.

Dr. Colston said that perhaps the only area where agreement has been reached is in the need for more money.

Dr. Butler said it was difficult to talk specifics about a bill in a climate where there are so many intangibles and so many qualitative things that should be preserved and not lost among those intangibles. He expressed appreciation to Dr. Blue for anticipating some of the things which had made this conference a little different from last year's and for bringing to it a new dimension.

He emphasized the urgency of early planning, saying that the best programs with early deadlines would normally receive the earliest implementation for he would not wish any of the people who had worked so closely and devotedly to miss consideration because they had made no concrete plans. He suggested that each participant at the conference obtain a copy of the bill - H.R. 9567 is its present number -- for it is the best measure at the moment by which to make judgments and preparations. He said that in Section III,

there is a provision for a program called the National Teaching Fellowships program, designed on the pattern of the Woodrow Wilson Fellows program, in the hope that it will be possible for bright young scholars to obtain the education they deserve. Although the initial emphasis has been upon the senior scholars, some concern has been given to the values in the long run for junior scholars. This program may now involve a junior scholar, provided he is hired by the college president who must justify that the student is a competent scholar and who applies for a scholarship on behalf of the junior. This offers protection in that the institution knows who is coming to it, and in the event the scholar does not work out well, the president and scholar share the responsibility.

He continued by saying that the senior scholar program will be an important part of the bill and that some of the suggestions made at the conference will offer a new educational dimension to the Office of Education, particularly in the participation of business and industry in cooperative relationships, which is an important element of the bill. Dr. Long and Dr. Gloster had mentioned excellent ways in which business and industry can be brought into the program, and Dr. Brown had mentioned the areas of tele-lectures and computer equipment. He added that over half of last year's Ph.D.'s had not gone into colleges or universities for teaching purposes but had gone into government and industry, but if these people were located near colleges, they could still constitute a valuable pool of people who could be utilized by the colleges. He mentioned one relationship, not yet announced by industry, which will have an interesting kind of community arrangement between colleges and business and industry whereby two national corporations plan to train young people for dispersement throughout the whole framework of

their operations. A manpower conference held at Southern University had brought attention dramatically to the people in industry of the loss to the South of bright young people trained and educated in the area because of the lack of job openings for them in industry in the South. Although a possible national conference of educators and industry had been suggested during the meeting, Dr. Butler said business and industry had already gone ahead in this field because last July, 300 corporations had sent representatives to a meeting held under the auspices of the Plans for Progress group of the President's Committee. Representatives from 80 colleges had also attended.

Dr. Butler said he wished to call attention to one feature of another section of the bill, the Library Section, in which there is an initial grant of \$5,000 for books and other library equipment to which every college will be eligible upon application. This section could be tied in to that part of Title III in which local and consortia arrangements will have as a basic component the pooling of library resources. Each institution in the agreement can apply for the basic \$5,000 grant, but there is also a special grant and a supplemental grant which both participating institutions can apply for to strengthen their joint library resources.

He said there is no actual definition of the types of arrangements which can be entered into under Title III and that the thinking and planning of programs is not limited. The concept of cooperative programs has long-term planning in mind and every developmental project will be expected to address itself to the long term or the eventual results which are expected to accrue from the arrangement. The amount of money presently involved in the bill is very small in comparison to the need; three large types of programs being involved at a cost of 30 million dollars. To illustrate, he said, the

National Teachers Fellowships program has an average cost of about \$7,000 per Fellow and any of the 800 colleges can ask for one or more Fellows, and the cost of exchange of a senior professor, in all probability, is even more than for one Fellow. He urged the participants to make their investment clear when they submitted a proposal so that the U.S. Office of Education could be in a position to justify to Congress the funds as supplementing projects already under way. Dr. Butler said that private foundations must still be depended upon to provide the basic funds for the accomplishment of the objectives and that the federal government cannot and should not be expected to provide the largest measure of support. The whole program will collapse if private donors withdraw their support when federal government enters the field financially.

He said that every person at the conference knew he had a serious job to do and that this nation would receive benefits from what appears to be a small effort now, but which will become the most valuable change in the total institutional structure of higher education that has occurred in the last century. He felt the key to this had been expressed by Dr. Spivey when he had used the word "involvement." The most important thing is that the nation has a heterogeneous array of people with talents and resources to offer to the future of the nation and added that he had nothing but the highest optimism about the future of these cooperative relationships, and, most certainly, the quality of them suggests they will be permanent.

Dr. Colston asked President Mays to close the conference.

Dr. Mays thanked Dr. Brisbane and Mrs. Sumlin for directing the conference so ably and thanked the participants for attending.

APPENDIX I (a)

THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE-TENNESSEE AGRICULTURAL AND INDUSTRIAL UNIVERSITY -MORRISTOWN COLLEGE-KNOXVILLE COLLEGE COOPERATIVE PROGRAMS

The University of Tennessee is involved in a modest program of cooperation with three Tennessee predominantly Negro colleges: Tennessee Agricultural and Industrial University in Nashville (200 miles from Knoxville), Morristown College in Morristown (a Methodist-related junior college 40 miles from Knoxville), and Knoxville College (a Presbyterian-related four-year liberal arts college in Knoxville).

Tennessee A & T University

The Tennessee College of Home Economics has consulted several times with Tennessee A & I on curricular improvement, has secured from them assistance in designing some home economics graduate courses and has employed some Tennessee A & I faculty members in teaching extension courses in home economics. Plans are now developing to provide a quarter or more of advanced home economics instruction on the Tennessee campus for Tennessee A & I students who are on temporary transfer to Tennessee for such courses. Likewise, and more extensively, the administrations of Tennessee A & I and Tennessee are working toward an exchange of visiting professors in several departments, which should materialize within the next twelve months. This pattern of cooperation was initiated by the almost simultaneous inquiry of both presidents and college deans of the two institutions.

Morristown College

Several months ago, Tennessee, upon the invitation of the president of Morristown and of a Tennessee trustee who lives in Morristown, began a program of technical assistance to Morristown with a twofold purpose: (1) to assist Morristown to undertake improvements which can be accomplished within its present resources, and (2) to help Morristown to identify long-term priorities of need, and project-applications, which will require outside financial assistance from governmental, foundation and private sources. There has been no charge for this service. To date, technical consultants from Tennessee have provided assistance, without charge, in the following areas: campus planning, fiscal administration, registration procedures and record-keeping, student personnel and counseling services are continuing in 1965-1966. Nine Tennessee consultants have been involved to date.

Knoxville College

A more comprehensive and older program of cooperation has developed with Knoxville and the prospects are very good for a large growth in this program, partly because of location in the same city but chiefly because of the happy experience with prior efforts. In order to give a fuller account of this growing program, I shall provide a few details under two headings: cooperative programs with Knoxville to the present, and plans for the immediate future.

Up to Now. In 1964, Dr. Colston, the President, Dr. Campbell, the Dean, both of Knoxville, apprised Tennessee officials of their plans for the further improvement of their institution. These plans, which were to require extensive foundation support for their successful implementation, underscored the need for closer and more formal ties with Tennessee. Tennessee assured

Knoxville of its willingness, indeed, its eagerness, to participate as fully as possible in the joint educational endeavor. As an initial step, strong letters of endorsement were prepared by Tennessee in support of requests made by Knoxville to the Carnegie Corporation of New York and to the Ford Foundation. Concurrently, plans were agreed upon to permit immediate joint exploration of possible additional types of cooperative relationships. Several months later, with foundation support assured, the more detailed plans described below were made to assist Knoxville.

From the outset, it was determined that channels of communication between the two institutions should be kept as flexible and as decentralized as possible. Policy matters relative to the various facets of the cooperative program are first explored by a small committee comprised of the President and the Dean of Knoxville and the Academic and Assistant Academic Vice-Presidents of Tennessee, in consultation with such other officials of the two institutions as may be considered appropriate. Decisions reached with regard to the desirability of undertaking cooperative projects are further explored, as necessary, at the operating levels within the two institutions to determine their feasibility and to establish administrative arrangements essential to their implementation.

The upgrading of Knoxville faculty members through advanced graduate study and under an arrangement whereby Tennessee will provide qualified faculty replacements is one of the most important phases of the cooperative program. Three members of the Knoxville faculty took work toward the doctorate at Tennessee in the 1964-1965 academic year. Several members of the faculty attended Tennessee's Summer Quarter in 1964, and several more registered in the 1965 Summer Quarter with financial assistance from Knoxville. Moreover,

four Tennessee graduate students were engaged to teach at Knoxville during the 1964-1965 academic year in an effort to bolster the Knoxville faculty in areas needing additional strength. Full-time members of Knoxville faculty who enroll in the Tennessee Graduate School are considered as State of Tennessee residents for tuition purposes.

A second facet of the cooperative program is designed to permit Knoxville to diversify and strengthen its existing curriculum by utilizing courses available at Tennessee. The principal areas in need of strengthening are in business administration, economics, psychology, and Spanish, although significant gaps exist in other fields as well.

During the 1964-1965 academic year, courses were taken by Knoxville students in mathematics, philosophy, political science, physics, geology, education, and engineering. Student transportation expense is defrayed by Knoxville. Knoxville sends a form letter to Tennessee's Dean of Admissions and Records certifying that the student is in good standing at Knoxville. Space is provided on this form to list the courses in which the students is to be registered. Tennessee bills Knoxville directly for normal fee charges. Copies of the students' grade reports are mailed to Knoxville so as to become part of the students' permanent record in accord with such policies concerning the evaluation and transfer of credit which Knoxville wishes to establish. An effort is made by Tennessee to keep course prerequisites as flexible as possible while, at the same time, preserving sound academic standards.

The practice of using regular Knoxville faculty members for laboratory assignments has limited their availability to teach regular courses and has restricted time available for research. Knoxville, therefore, needs qualified graduate students to serve as laboratory assistants, particularly in such

fields as biology, chemistry and physics. Another area of need involves tutorial service to help Knoxville students overcome deficiencies in foreign languages, sciences, and mathematics. The cooperative program with Knoxville has not developed to the point of providing laboratory and tutorial services by Tennessee graduate students, although plans are being made to provide such services in the future under stipends to be made available by Knoxville. In instances when laboratory and tutorial assistants are recruited by Knoxville or by Tennessee from outside the University of Tennessee, they may be admitted to Tennessee's Graduate School under the same regulations that apply to other graduate students.

During the past year, several professors from Tennessee have been used as consultants in connection with special programs and workshops at Knoxville. Psychological services, on a limited basis, have been made available through the Guidance Office and the Health Services Office of Knoxville. Tennessee faculty members also offered lectures or participated in Chapel programs during the year. Invitations are extended regularly to Knoxville students to attend the weekly colloquium sponsored by the Tennessee Department of Physics. In the area of technical assistance, Tennessee has provided cost estimates to Knoxville relative to the installation of an FM radio station.

Plans for the Immediate Future. At least two, and possibly three, members of the Knoxville faculty will be released to take graduate work leading to the doctorate at Tennessee during the 1965-1966 academic year.

One language laboratory assistant (a Tennessee graduate student) has been employed by Knoxville for the 1965-1966 academic year. It is anticipated that this modest beginning of an important phase of the cooperative program will be gradually expanded. Knoxville will use Tennessee's application

files for teaching assistants and graduate assistants as a prime recruitment source to fill vacancies for such posts.

Beginning in the Fall Quarter, 1965, Tennessee's introductory economics course, Economics 211-2-3, will be transmitted to Knoxville by closed-circuit television. Knoxville will furnish its own classroom instructor to monitor the course, and will prepare and administer its own examinations. The Tennessee professor in charge of this course has agreed to meet periodically during the year with Knoxville students so as to lend a personal touch to the program. It is probable that courses in sociology and mathematics will also be televised to Knoxville during the year. This program of sharing televised courses taught by Tennessee faculty members will probably become extensive; but Tennessee, which is making no charge for such instruction in 1965-1966, may have to develop a plan of cost-sharing since the costs are borne by State of Tennessee appropriations for students attending Tennessee.

Knoxville and Tennessee are exploring the possibility of joint appointments in economics, political science, art, marketing, and accounting. These are all fields which are relatively new to the Knoxville curriculum. A modest program of faculty exchange is also contemplated beginning, if possible, in the 1965-1966 academic year. From the point of view of Knoxville, the most feasible place to begin this program is in the field of biology.

Plans have been completed for participation by Knoxville in the binary program offered by Tennessee's College of Engineering. Under this program, a student will complete three years of undergraduate work at Knoxville, followed by two years at Tennessee. At the end of his fourth year he will be awarded a bachelor's degree by Knoxville if he has succeeded; at the end of the fifth year he will receive his bachelor's degree in engineering from

Tennessee.

Knoxville will explore the possibility of using Tennessee's Computing Center on a contract basis for the purpose of automating registration procedures.

Knoxville has expressed interest in establishing relationships with Tennessee which would permit certain of its students who have otherwise completed work toward their degrees to register for educational methods courses and student teaching at Tennessee. Discussions will be held with the Tennessee College of Education to determine whether this can be accomplished within the framework of its standards and state certification regulations.

Discussions will be held with Knoxville relative to Tennessee's assistance in the development of further teaching materials suited to disadvantaged youth and to the conduct of an institute for secondary teachers concerning the utilization of such material.

Tennessee and Knoxville are currently exploring with a major foundation the possibility of a grant to identify problems faced by displaced Negro teachers and institutional responsibilities for coping with such problems.

Although cooperative efforts with these three colleges have been very modest to date, The University of Tennessee is well pleased with the results and will be seeking expansions, including ways of receiving from these colleges values which they can provide to Tennessee. At present Tennessee is seeking funds from the federal government for a project in which Knoxville will be an indispensable partner.

Herman E. Spivey, Academic Vice-President
University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tenn.

APPENDIX I (b)

THE KNOXVILLE COLLEGE-UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE COOPERATIVE PROGRAM

How the Institutions Became Involved

The University of Tennessee and Knoxville College are located in the same city, and, for a considerable period of time, the administrative officers and faculty members of the two institutions have worked together in a variety of ways. For example, Tennessee faculty members have served Knoxville as consultants, lecturers and, upon occasions, taught classes when Knoxville was in need of extra people. Tennessee departmental chairmen have helped Knoxville secure faculty members by recommending qualified people from their files. Tennessee faculty members have attended and participated in various activities on the Knoxville campus; likewise, Knoxville faculty and staff have been active participants in a variety of programs on the Tennessee campus, including meetings of professional societies and as lecturers on special occasions. For example, the President of Knoxville lectured to classes in higher education at Tennessee each quarter for a two-year period.

There has been some exchange of cultural programs; the Knoxville choir and one of Tennessee's orchestras gave a joint concert at Tennessee's Student Center, the Knoxville choir director serving as the director of the joint group. Similar programs have been given on the Knoxville campus, whereby instrumental groups from Tennessee and soloists from Tennessee's Voice Department joined with the Knoxville choir in an annual Christmas concert.

Until recently, all these activities have been unofficial; they were expressions of mutual interest and cooperation on the part of individual faculty members and organizations. Two years ago, through a joint conference between Knoxville and Tennessee officials, plans were developed for an official arrangement of cooperation between the two institutions. Attending the initial conference were the following representatives: the Vice-President for Academic Affairs, the Assistant Vice-President for Academic Affairs, the Dean of the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, the Dean of Admissions and Records, all of Tennessee, and the President and Dean of Knoxville. The areas of cooperation agreed upon at this conference as an initial working basis included: (1) the strengthening of offerings at Knoxville by making available to its students undergraduate courses at Tennessee, and making available to Tennessee students courses at Knoxville; (2) the development of Knoxville faculty through graduate study opportunities at Tennessee and by making available graduate students and, upon occasions, regular Tennessee faculty members to Knoxville as substitutes for their teachers on study-leave; and (3) making available to Knoxville various technical facilities and services.

Organization of the Program

The program is coordinated by the Dean of Knoxville and the Assistant Vice-President for Academic Affairs at Tennessee. For example, the Dean of Knoxville will inform the Assistant Vice-President of Tennessee of the needs of Knoxville for a particular year and the Assistant Vice-President will then clear these needs with various departments at Tennessee.

The Dean of Knoxville certifies its students who wish to take courses at Tennessee and the students present their credentials at Tennessee and are registered as any other students under normal procedure.

Concrete Activities

1. Knoxville students take courses at Tennessee.
2. Knoxville faculty members enroll in graduate programs at Tennessee.
3. Tennessee faculty members teach courses at Knoxville as an extra load;
Knoxville teachers teach courses at Tennessee as an extra load.
4. Knoxville utilizes Tennessee teaching fellows.
5. On the basis of courses at Tennessee available to Knoxville students,
Knoxville has increased its offerings to include majors in business administration, economics, philosophy, psychology and Spanish.
6. Knoxville makes use of Tennessee's closed-circuit educational television program.
7. In the fall of 1965, Knoxville will join the 3-2 Engineering Program.
8. Knoxville and Tennessee faculty members serve each other in the capacity of lecturers, consultants and as participants in various assemblies and institutes.

Problems Involved

The major problem facing Knoxville is that of scheduling, since it is on the semester system and Tennessee is on the quarter system. Another problem that might develop is that of financing the educational television program.

James A. Colston, President,
Knoxville College, Knoxville, Tenn.

APPENDIX II (a)

FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY-FLORIDA A & M UNIVERSITY

COOPERATIVE PROGRAM

In the academic year of 1964-1965, the Florida State University and the Florida A & M University began a cooperative program for the development of the faculty at Florida A & M. The joint project was financed in part by a State of Florida subsidy and in part by a \$100,000 grant from the Carnegie Foundation.

The development plan has several interrelated features:

- (1) Any faculty member of Florida A & M may register as a special student for one course per term at Florida State on the same basis as Florida State faculty and staff members, i.e., without fees. The courses taken can serve either as refresher work for faculty not seeking an advanced degree or as preparation for a degree program. Florida State awards graduate credit for such work to all students who have been admitted to the Florida State Graduate School.
2. Any faculty member of Florida A & M who wishes to enroll for an advanced degree at Florida State may apply for a fellowship under what is called the "Carnegie Grant Program." Fellowships underwrite four terms of full-time graduate study at \$300 per month, plus \$50 per month for each dependent up to a maximum of four dependents. Recipients of these awards are required to study for at least two consecutive regular terms and it is pre-

ferred that the two consecutive terms be at the beginning of the student's study. Timing of subsequent study terms is determined by the student with his major advisor with a major purpose being to provide one or two terms for full-time work on the dissertation. Of necessity, such timing entails cooperation of the Florida A & M administration in the employment of the faculty members who are intermittently students on a full-time basis at Florida State. The Florida A & M administration has been very considerate of Florida A&M faculty member-students in balancing its interest in faculty improvement with the operational needs of the university.

3. Any faculty member of Florida A & M who wishes to have time released for post-doctoral research or study may apply for support under the Carnegie Grant Program. The program is designed to cover the costs of released time for one or two selected members of the Florida A & M faculty each year. The research of the faculty member may be carried on wherever appropriate, and is not restricted to Florida State. This provision for released time supplements an existing arrangement which makes Florida State's research facilities and library available to Florida A & M faculty.
4. Florida A & M may solicit advice and assistance from Florida State whenever its administrators deem it desirable for the development of honors or other programs designed to motivate and prepare more of its undergraduates for graduate study, or in the recruitment and development of bright young people who are potential faculty. In its latter dimension, this feature of the program includes the award of one or two incentive scholarships to needy and able Florida A & M students to enable them to attend graduate school either at Florida State or at the university of their choice.

In the first year of the cooperative program, 1964-1965, twenty Florida A & M faculty members took course-work at Florida State. Five of these were full-time students working on doctoral degrees under Carnegie grants. Their subject fields represented almost a cross-section of the academic curriculum: English, foreign languages (with emphasis on Spanish), history, mathematics, and the Interdivisional Program in Marriage and Family Living (home economics, social welfare, and sociology). Research awards from the Carnegie funds were made to three Florida A & M faculty members, who already hold doctoral degrees; one of \$2,500 covering released time for part of the year and expenses incidental research, and the two other for relatively small sums (\$500 and \$1,000 respectively) to cover expenses incidental to research but not covering released time. During the first year no incentive scholarships were awarded to Florida A & M graduating seniors.

For the forthcoming academic year (1965-1966), three more Florida A & M faculty members have been approved for Carnegie grants to underwrite doctoral study programs at Florida State. The three recipients will study in elementary education, English and modern languages (French). For the first time an incentive scholarship has been awarded to an able and needy graduating senior at Florida A & M permitting his entrance into an MA program (history) at Florida State.

Administrative costs of the program have been borne by the universities. The importance of the program is indicated by the level of those who constituted its committee for design and control. The President, the Dean of the University, and the Deans of the Graduate School and the School of Education of Florida A & M, and the President, the Dean of the Graduate School, and a professor of government (who is also Assistant Dean of the Graduate School) of

Florida State have met many times throughout the year to decide upon policy and awards to recipients. At no meeting have fewer than six of these eight persons been present and usually the attendance has been even higher.

The exchange of views within this committee has been salutary. Joint evaluation of applicants for assistance under the Carnegie program has brought to bear a variety of viewpoints and competencies, which has been educational to all participants and enhanced the likelihood that those chosen will prove successful. Four of the five selected the first year for support in their doctoral programs completed the first year's work with highly respectable course grades. Two passed their doctoral qualifying examinations successfully and one of them completed the language requirements as well. One of the five proved inadequately prepared and it was decided that he should take one course each term in order to build a more adequate base before he returns to full-time student status. In consideration of post-doctoral awards for research, the use by Florida State of a Faculty Research Council in screening research proposals afforded a model of some utility. It is hoped that the Carnegie awards will stimulate a regularly budgeted program for underwriting faculty research. If so, Florida A & M will have been enabled to adopt a helpful practice of the senior, formerly all-white, universities of the state. The universities then can combine in seeking state support for this important faculty activity.

Motivation or interest in launching the program would be difficult to assess; there were at least as many different motivations or interests as there were groups or individuals involved in launching it. Professional interest was certainly involved in the motivation; education is a joint concern of all the professional people involved. It is not irrelevant to mention

that the professional interest of Florida State's president, Dr. Gordon Blackwell (who has since departed) was community sociology. Rumors that Florida A & M might suffer a change in status if its faculty did not acquire a higher percentage of doctorates were not uninfluential with some elements of the power structure that had to approve or at least acquiesce in the program. It is evident that both those strongly in favor of segregation and those strongly in favor of integration could, and did, support the program. Negro students have become commonplace at Florida State and the Carnegie program has been largely responsible for this. In the process, Florida State recovered the control over its admissions which had been lost following the segregation cases. (For some years, any application from a Negro for admission to Florida State, or to any other white university in Florida, had been forwarded to the State Board of Control -- now the Board of Regents -- for action). Now, applications from Negroes are handled routinely by the university without discrimination. In fact, figures are hard to find as race is being deleted from one form after another in university processing. As nearly as could be ascertained for this report, 98 new Negro students were admitted and 133 attended Florida State during the year 1964-1965. Admittedly, this is a small portion of Florida State's student body, but the curve of Negro admissions shows a sharp trend upwards. Hopefully, motivations are changing to a concern for education in which race is irrelevant.

Problems have been few, unless the problems of desegregation, as intensified by the influx of Negro students into the white university, are linked to the Carnegie program.

An important concern is that a faculty member of Florida A & M undertakes a risk in applying for a grant to pursue his doctoral work. Failure is

an evident possibility as one of the carefully selected group proved; the student in question made the effort to succeed but his preparation, which, on the record, seemed adequate, was inadequate. In this case it was not the difficulty of assessing course-work taken at universities whose standards were too little known to be judged but the apparent application of a double standard by a well-known university and department that caused the trouble. That such practices serve us all ill should be evident by now. These problems, too, we can and must meet in our common quest for excellence.

In conclusion, it should be noted that both universities are benefiting from the Florida A & M and Florida State cooperative program. New tactics, such as faculty exchange, for the improvement of both institutions, are already being considered.

Thomas R. Lewis, Dean
Florida State University,
Tallahassee, Florida

APPENDIX II (b)

THE FLORIDA A & M UNIVERSITY-FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY COOPERATIVE PROGRAM

As a small state university, Florida Agricultural and Mechanical University has been limited in the scope and extent of its participation in cooperative programs. Although controlled state appropriations may have reduced to a degree the solicitation of outside financial resources, its operational and academic problems have been similar to those facing other predominantly Negro private colleges.

Experience in Cooperative Program

Based on an intense desire to upgrade its faculty, the administration of Florida A & M sought and received financial assistance from the Carnegie Foundation. A cooperative arrangement was effected with Florida State to provide assistance in the development and improvement of the faculty at Florida A & M through advanced degrees, refresher work and research.

A joint committee composed of members of both universities developed a program for:

1. Upgrading faculty qualifying for doctoral study.
2. Encouraging superior graduates from Florida A & M to pursue a graduate degree at Florida State.
3. Motivating faculty to initiate individual research projects by awarding small grants.

Through the Carnegie grant and the cooperative arrangements with

Florida State, 40 fellowships have been offered over a five-year period. Funds have also been allocated for replacements of the faculty who are nominated fellows. The administrative costs of the program are to be absorbed by Florida State and Florida A & M jointly.

To date, under this cooperative arrangement, eight faculty have worked toward the doctoral degree, three Florida A & M graduates have worked toward the Master's degree and three research grants have been awarded to professors after their proposals had been carefully screened by the University Research Committee.

In addition to the above specifics of the program which was made possible by the grant, the cooperative arrangement between the two universities includes:

1. The availability of research and library facilities to the Florida A & M faculty.
2. The permission for any member of the faculty to enroll as a special student for one course per trimester at no charge.

The State Board of Regents has created twelve or more inter-university committees, on which Florida A & M has equal representation.

Problems

1. A free mutual exchange of faculty on both campuses has been limited.
2. Many faculty and graduating seniors desire upgrading but are restricted as to choice of institution. This limits the number who seek the advantages of the program.

Dimensions and Projections of Programmed Activities for Strengthening Small Colleges

Practically all the predominantly Negro institutions face the same

problems in terms of modifying the curriculum to meet present day needs: vying for facilities; research and developmental funds; and meeting the challenge of total integration.

There is an urgency to find ways of enabling Negro high school graduates to bridge the gap between achievements in high school and the expectations of college entrance examination. More time and funds must be expended toward helping what appears to be sub-standard high school students to develop their maximum potential in a college program. Funds and energy must also be devoted toward programs that stress more individualized or tutorial instruction for the academically talented, already enrolled, as a means of stimulating this human resource to move above mediocre scholastic achievement. Guidance and vocational orientation programs must be changed drastically if the young student is to be prepared to meet the wide expanse of new economic opportunities.

The effective implementation of such programs will necessitate better and more adequate remedial facilities and additional well-trained faculty to deal with this two-pronged attack on the development and training of our youth.

Benjamin Perry
Florida A & M University, Tallahassee, Fla.

APPENDIX III

THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-NORTH CAROLINA COLLEGE EXCHANGE PROGRAM

The exchange program involving the University of Wisconsin and North Carolina College grew from the interest of the University of Wisconsin and the Carnegie Corporation in establishing programs linking Wisconsin to predominantly Negro Southern institutions. In 1963, Dr. Fred H. Harrington, the President of Wisconsin, assigned his special assistant, Mr. Donald R. McNeil, to explore the possibilities of such programs. Three Southern colleges were tentatively selected: the Agricultural and Technical College of North Carolina; North Carolina College; and Texas Southern University. Mr. McNeil visited these colleges in October and November, 1963, to discuss the feasibility of such programs and possible areas of cooperation.

Mr. McNeil conferred with the president and other administrative officials of the selected Negro institutions. These officials in turn discussed the possibilities with the faculties of the institutions involved. At North Carolina College the conferences and discussion with Mr. McNeil were followed by additional conferences and discussion with Mr. Fred Jackson of the Carnegie Corporation. From these conferences and discussion a concept of an exchange program began to emerge as perhaps the most feasible area of cooperation. Further discussions with both A & T College of North Carolina and Texas Southern indicated that this idea also seemed to them a most fruitful avenue of cooperation.

This concept accordingly was developed into a proposal and submitted by Wisconsin to the Carnegie Corporation. At the same time, Dr. Harrington appointed a Wisconsin Committee on Cooperation with Negro Universities (CCNU) to coordinate the program. At North Carolina College a similar committee composed of representatives from the various disciplines and administrative activities and entitled the Wisconsin Liaison Committee (WLSU) was appointed to coordinate the program here. At this time the proposal consisted of provision for an exchange of faculty members and students.

Throughout the early part of 1964, WLSU continued to meet and define the directions the expected exchange should take. It considered the types of faculty members North Carolina College wished to send to Wisconsin and the type it expected to receive in return. It also considered the types of students it would send to Wisconsin and the types of students it would exchange. Concurrently, representatives of CCNU visited North Carolina College and conferred with the WLSU and with members of the departments of their particular disciplines and interests.

In June, 1964, the Carnegie Corporation granted \$300,000 to finance the program and indicated that funding would take place sometime during the late summer. The program as financed eliminated student exchange and kept only the idea of a faculty exchange. In July, 1964, a Planning Workshop for the exchange program was held on Wisconsin's Madison Campus. At this workshop, three representatives from each of the three Southern colleges and representatives from CCNU discussed various directions the program might take. The discussions centered on areas and types of activities and each of the Southern schools was asked to submit a proposal of its general recommendations for use of the Carnegie Funds to CCNU. The proposals for the expenditure of

funds would be presented to the committee and acted on individually. It was generally agreed that the major area of activity would be faculty improvement and that this faculty improvement would largely center on upgrading the faculties of the Negro institutions through study either at Wisconsin or elsewhere and a replacement for these faculty members by members of the Wisconsin faculty or persons secured by Wisconsin. At the same time, Carnegie released the funds for the project and approximately \$90,000 was made available to North Carolina College for use as its share of the exchange activities, \$10,000 being set aside for administrative expenses.

Because the funding occurred so late in the year, North Carolina deemed it inadvisable to begin the program immediately. Instead, WLSU devoted its activities to determining areas in which the exchange could best take place and the priorities to be assigned to each area. It was decided generally to devote approximately 60 percent of the funds to faculty improvement in the form of long-term study toward the terminal degree for "the most promising" faculty members, and to divide the remaining 40 percent among consultation activities, cooperative research and short-term study projects.

As a result of these decisions, during the 1965-1966 school year, five faculty members of North Carolina College will engage in long-term study toward the terminal degree. One cooperative research program -- Project English Sequence -- will begin operation, and one set of arrangements for activities involving consultative services will begin. In addition, during the summer of 1965, a faculty member of North Carolina College has been teaching in an institute at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, being replaced at North Carolina College by a person secured by Wisconsin.

The program paid the full salary and academic expenses plus an allowance

for cost of living and books for the North Carolina College teachers engaged in the long-term study for the terminal degree. The program also paid for the salary differential between North Carolina College teachers and the Wisconsin faculty members who replaced them, plus a dislocation and "hardship" allowance for the Wisconsin faculty member. For shorter term projects, the program paid the actual academic cost plus a transportation allowance for the participating member. Project English Sequence is funded at \$1,000 for the first phase and \$4,000 for the second phase. The consultative services project has not yet been estimated.

Cecil Patterson, Director,
The Summer School
North Carolina College, Durham, N.C.

APPENDIX IV

THE SOUTHERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY-WINSTON-SALEM STATE COLLEGE COOPERATIVE PROGRAM

In April, 1964, the president of Winston-Salem State College met Dr. Elmer J. Clark, who is now Dean of the School of Education at Southern Illinois University. The two discussed possibilities of a joint endeavor between these two institutions or between Winston-Salem State College and another agency. During October, 1964, upon the invitation of Dr. Clark, a relationship was begun between Southern Illinois University and Winston-Salem State College.

Dr. Kenneth Williams, the President, and Dr. Lafayette Parker, the Dean of Winston-Salem visited the faculty and administration of both the Carbondale and Edwardsville campuses of Southern Illinois during the past academic year. Dr. Delyte W. Morris, the President, and Dr. William McKeefery, Dr. Elmer Clark, and Dr. Wilbur Moulton, Deans, all of Southern Illinois, visited the Winston-Salem State campus during this same period. The purpose of these visits was to discuss the possible sources of an exchange which would be mutually beneficial to both universities.

These institutions became involved in a program because of the interest of the two administrations. The motivating force was the belief that mutual gains could be achieved by a cooperative exchange.

Winston-Salem State and Southern Illinois constitute a rather unusual

and potentially very fruitful association of institutions, which are similar and yet unlike. Winston-Salem State is relatively small, has a single campus, restricts itself at present to undergraduate programs, and is engaged primarily in the education of teachers. Southern Illinois is large, has several campuses as well as extensive service operations here and abroad, is engaged increasingly in graduate education, and has programs in most of the academic and professional fields. In size, resources, and scope and level of programs, the two institutions seem dissimilar. From this disparity can come, to be sure, certain benefits to both parties; Southern Illinois can make its considerable resources available to Winston-Salem State and the latter can offer scarce, specialized resources to Southern Illinois. Even more important, Winston-Salem State can furnish to Southern Illinois as a counterweight to multiversity, the close-to-the-student vantage point that is part of its tradition and that has not as yet been lost through size and diffusion of focus.

Paradoxically, these two institutions also have many things in common. Twenty years ago, Southern Illinois was not much larger than Winston-Salem State is now. Southern Illinois also turned toward graduate work at about the same time and although it is still predominantly undergraduate, graduate work through to the doctorate level is now being given sharply increased emphasis. Its programs, although encompassing most of the academic spectrum, still emphasize teacher education more than is common in most large universities. The move toward liberal arts, which Winston-Salem State is now making, was made by Southern Illinois only since World War II, mostly since the early 1950's.

Thus, although Southern Illinois has passed the take-off point and

Winston-Salem State may not yet have reached it, the two institutions are much closer together in heritage, in rationale, and in time than their disparate sizes and current stage of development would suggest. The two institutions share also a common concern for the welfare and economic development of their immediate regions, as well as a deep and pervasive common dedication to the extension of educational opportunity to those who might otherwise be denied it.

These two institutions, superficially so different and yet with so much in common, are now entering into a true partnership, which should benefit both institutions and enable both, individually and jointly, to improve and extend educational opportunity.

The major purpose of the exchange program between Southern Illinois and Winston-Salem State is to increase the academic quality of the two developing institutions.

The program was organized by setting up a working committee on each campus and appointing a liaison person at each of the institutions. The groups explored, and are still exploring, the possibilities of an exchange of faculty and students which may benefit one or both institutions.

The first phase of the project was terminated in a cooperative planning program by both institutions in June, 1965, on the Carbondale campus of Southern Illinois. Four faculty members of Winston-Salem were in residence on the Southern Illinois Carbondale campus to assist in developing the preliminary plans for possible long-range exchange between the two institutions. A budget of \$10,000 was committed by Southern Illinois to support the June conference. In addition to this direct allocation of funds, it is estimated that the implicit costs to date, for which no direct charges to the project

have been made, are over \$15,000. Administrative officers from Winston-Salem State visited the Carbondale campus periodically to participate in the planning activities. Consultants from interested federal agencies and professional associations also participated in the June conference, the outcome of which included a statement proposing possible specific exchange programs between the two institutions for which detailed plans for implementing the projects must be written. Proposed dates for implementing these specific projects will be another outcome of the June conference.

In addition to the June conference, a modest faculty exchange program has been effected. Professor Orville Alexander from the Department of Government at Southern Illinois taught in the summer of 1965 on the Winston-Salem State campus and Professor Nathan Simms from the Mathematics Department at Winston-Salem taught on the Carbondale campus.

Phase Two of the project has been designed to (1) develop the detailed plans for a long-range exchange program between Southern Illinois and Winston-Salem State to increase the academic quality of both institutions and (2) test the feasibility of the planned exchange programs through pilot or exploratory efforts. The objectives for Phase Two are to design and test through pilot projects the following exchange programs between Winston-Salem State and Southern Illinois:

1. Faculty exchange program including such efforts as teaching, guest lecturing, visiting scholars in residence, consultation, short seminars, workshops and internships.
2. Graduate and undergraduate student exchange programs including such efforts as student government participation, housing exchanges, extra-curricular activities, athletic demonstrations, and fraternity and sorority exchanges.

3. Research exchange program including such efforts as research in the economic development of the geographical area adjacent to both institutions, comparative speech patterns, sociological studies and curriculum development studies.
4. Administrative and technical staff exchanges including such efforts as library and learning center development projects, intern programs, consultation on joint faculty recruiting programs, conferences on physical plant planning and building projects, conferences on fiscal planning and institutional research conferences and seminars.
5. Cultural exchange program including such efforts as the loan of art exhibits, exchange of performing artists in dance, music, theatre, and etc.

Lafayette Parker, Dean of Instruction,
Winston-Salem State College
Winston-Salem, North Carolina

APPENDIX V

THE TOUGALOO COLLEGE-BROWN UNIVERSITY

COOPERATIVE PROGRAM

The Tougaloo College-Brown University Cooperative Program began in a context of mutual concern. On the one hand, the Tougaloo Board of Trustees was concerned with strengthening Tougaloo in the face of growing educational demands by present and future generations of Negro students; on the other hand, at Brown there was a growing recognition of the University's responsibility to play a useful and productive role in meeting this same challenge.

Dr. Barnaby C. Keeney, the President of Brown, was approached by two members of the Tougaloo Board of Trustees in 1963 and invited to investigate ways in which the talents and resources of Brown might be made available to help develop Tougaloo's resources. The institutional relationship began with conversations between the Development Director at Brown and the President of Tougaloo, followed by a visit by two members of the Brown staff who made a detailed survey of the resources of Tougaloo based on interviews with students, faculty and administration. It progressed through formal visitations to Brown by members of the Tougaloo faculty, administration and Board of Trustees, who met both individually and as a group with their Brown counterparts in November, 1963, and again in April, 1964.

In the late spring of 1964, the President of Brown brought the matter of a working relationship with Tougaloo before the Brown faculty. Early in June, 1964, I was invited and agreed to serve as the Director of the Coopera-

tive Program. My appointment was by the Boards of Trustees of both institutions, and I am directly responsible to the Presidents of Brown and Tougaloo.

In my intermediate position, I have had the privilege of attending sessions of the Board of Trustees of Tougaloo, including their monthly executive committee meetings. Indeed, I regard the willingness of the Tougaloo Board to supplement their traditional two meetings a year with monthly executive sessions as one of the most auspicious new developments. I was also privileged to participate in the weekly meetings of the Tougaloo Educational Policy Committee, an administration-faculty group concerned with the discussion of both academic and administrative policy, in support of the acting president.

During the past academic year, I have spent most of my time at Tougaloo, where I taught juniors and seniors for two semesters. To keep the lines of communication open, I have made numerous trips between Brown and Tougaloo, and, during the second semester, I taught a graduate seminar at Brown. One of my additional functions has been to represent the program to appropriate officials of the government as well as interested educational agencies and foundations, especially in the South.

List of Program Activities

1. Fund Raising
2. Recruitment and Admissions
3. Post-Baccalaureate Education
4. Space Utilization Study
5. Master Planning
6. Brown Visiting Faculty Recruitment
7. Faculty and Curriculum Development
8. Library Development

9. Pre-Freshman Summer Program
10. Brown and Pembroke Junior Semester at Tougaloo
11. Brown Linguistics Project
12. Numerous Projects and Activities Oriented to the Development of an Established Habit of Intercommunication between the Two Institutions.

Harold W. Pfautz, professor of sociology,
Brown University, Providence, R.I.

and

Director, Tougaloo-Brown Cooperative
Program

RELATED LITERATURE

Earl J. McGrath, The Predominantly Negro Colleges and Universities in Transition, New York, The Institute of Higher Education, 1965.

Expanding Opportunities, the Negro and Higher Education, edited by Lawrence E. Dennis and Theodore J. Marchese, American Council on Education, especially Volume I, No.3 and Volume II, Nos.3 and 4.

Calon N. Drewry and Gurwood Long, University Assistance to Developing Institutions, Institute of Higher Education, Athens, Georgia, 1965.

Harold W. Pfautz and Paul D. Davis, A Working Conference on Post-Baccalaureate Education, Providence, Rhode Island, Brown University.

Wesley A. Hotchkiss, "Does Integration Threaten the Negro College?" United Church of Christ Council for Higher Education Journal, Volume II, No.7, April, 1965.

Carnegie Corporation of New York Quarterly, "Strengthening the American Academic Community," Volume XIII, No.1, January, 1965.

Institute of Human Relations, The University of Wisconsin, Blueprint for Action by Universities for Achieving Integration in Education, 1964.